Noname manuscript No.
(will be inserted by the editor)

The stratification by rank for homogeneous polynomials with border rank 5 which essentially depend on 5 variables

Edoardo Ballico

arXiv:1702.01914v1 [math.AG] 7 Feb 2017

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract We give the stratification by the symmetric tensor rank of all degree $d \geq 9$ homogeneous polynomials with border rank 5 and which depend essentially on at least 5 variables, extending previous works (A. Bernardi, A. Gimigliano, M. Idà, E. Ballico) on lower border ranks. For the polynomials which depend on at least 5 variables only 5 ranks are possible: 5, $d+3$, $2d+1$, $3d-1$, $4d-3$, but each of the ranks $3d-1$ and $2d+1$ is achieved in two geometrically different situations. These ranks are uniquely determined by a certain degree 5 zero-dimensional scheme A associated to the polynomial. The polynomial f depends essentially on at least 5 variables if and only if A is linearly independent (in all cases f essentially depends on exactly 5 variables). The polynomial has rank $4d-3$ (resp $3d-1$, resp. $2d+1$, resp. $d+3$, resp. 5) if A has 1 (resp. 2, resp. 3, resp. 4, resp. 5) connected components. The assumption $d \geq 9$ guarantees that each polynomial has a uniquely determined associated scheme A. In each case we describe the dimension of the families of the polynomials with prescribed rank, each irreducible family being determined by the degrees of the connected components of the associated scheme A.

Keywords symmetric tensor rank · symmetric rank · border rank · cactus rank

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) 14N05

Partially supported by MIUR and GNSAGA of INdAM

E. Ballico
Dept. of Mathematics, University of Trento, 38123 Trento (Italy)
Tel.: 39+0461281646
Fax: 39+0461281624 E-mail: ballico@science.unitn.it

1 Introduction

Let $\mathbb{C}[x_0,\dots,x_m]_d$ be the set of all homogeneous degree d polynomials in the variables $x_0,\dots,x_m$ with complex coefficients. For any $f \in \mathbb{C}[x_0,\dots,x_m]_d\setminus\{0\}$ the *rank* of f (or the *symmetric tensor rank* of f) is the minimal integer $r>0$ such that $f=\sum_{i=1}^{r}\ell_i^d$ with $\ell_i \in \mathbb{C}[x_0,\dots,x_m]_1$. These additive decompositions of f as sums of d-powers of linear forms are useful even to decompose symmetric tensors and hence they appear in some applications ([1], [14], [16], [10], [15], [27], [12], [22], [24]). A different notion is the notion of *border rank* of f or approximate rank of f (the minimal integer r such that f is the limit of a family of homogeneous polynomials of rank $\le r$). Both notions may be translated in the setting of projective geometry and algebraic geometry and it is in this setting that it was done the classification of all f with border rank ≤ 3 ([5, Theorems 32 and 37]) and of border rank 4 ([4]). In this paper we give the classification of all f with border rank 5 AND which depend essentially on at least 5 variables (in each case P depends on exactly 5 variables, because it is contained in the degree d Veronese embedding of a 4-dimensional linear subspace of $\mathbb{P}^m$). This is a strong condition and in Remark 9 and Proposition 6 we explain our knowledge of the rank for polynomials depending on fewer variables.

Now we explain the translation of the additive decomposition of homogeneous polynomials in terms of projective geometry. For all positive integers m,d let $\nu_d : \mathbb{P}^m \to \mathbb{P}^r$, $\binom{r:=m+d}{m-1}$, denote the Veronese embedding induced by the vector space $\mathbb{C}[x_0,\dots,x_m]_d$. Set $X_{m,d} := \nu_d(\mathbb{P}^m)$. For any $P \in \mathbb{P}^r$ the *rank* (or *symmetric tensor rank* or *symmetric rank*) $r_{m,d}(P)$ of P is the minimal cardinality of a set $S \subset X_{m,d}$ such that $P \in \langle \nu_d(S)\rangle$, where $\langle\ \ \rangle$ denote the linear span. For any integer $t \ge 1$ the t-secant variety $\sigma_t(X_{m,d})$ of $X_{m,d}$ is the closure in $\mathbb{P}^r$ of the union of all linear spaces $\langle \nu_d(S)\rangle$ with $S \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ and $\sharp(S) \le t$ (to get the closure it is the same if we use the euclidean topology or the Zariski topology). This approximation makes sense for homogeneous polynomials, too: the homogeneous polynomial f is a limit of a family of homogeneous polynomials with rank $\le t$ if and only if its associated point in $\mathbb{P}^r$ is contained in $\sigma_t(X_{m,d})$. Notice that " closure " in the definition of $\sigma_t(X_{m,d})$ is a good way to formalize the approximation by points with rank $\le t$. Set $\sigma_0(X_{m,d}) = \emptyset$. The *border rank* $b_{r,m}(P)$ of P is the minimal integer $t>0$ such that $P \in \sigma_t(X_{m,d})$, i.e. the only integer $b>0$ such that $P \in \sigma_b(X_{m,d}) \setminus \sigma_{b-1}(X_{m,d})$. The *cactus rank* ([6], [28]) (introduced in [23] with the name *scheme-rank*) $z_{m,d}(P)$ of P is the minimal integer z such that there is a zero-dimensional scheme $Z \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ with $\deg(Z)=z$ and $P \in \langle \nu_d(Z)\rangle$. We always have $z_{m,d}(P) \le r_{m,d}(P)$. If $d \ge b_{r,m}(P)-1$, then $z_{r,m}(P) \le b_{r,m}(P)$ and often equality holds. We are interested in points with border rank 5 and we assume that d is not too low, e.g., we assume $d \ge 9$. Since $d \ge 4$ and $b_{m,d}(P)=5$, we have $z_{m,d}(P) \le 5$ and hence we get at least one scheme A with $\deg(A) \le 5$ and $P \in \langle \nu_d(A)\rangle$. Now assume $m \ge 4$, $d \ge 4$ and that $P \notin \langle \nu_d(M)\rangle$ for any linear subspace M of $\mathbb{P}^m$ with $\dim(M) \le 3$, i.e. assume that the polynomial f associated to P does not depend on at most 4 variables, up to a linear change of coordinates.

Since $P \in \langle \nu_d(A) \rangle$, the condition " $P \notin \langle \nu_d(M) \rangle$ for any linear subspace M of $\mathbb{P}^m$ with $\dim(M) \leq 3$ " implies $\dim(\langle A \rangle) = 4$, i.e. A is linearly independent. Assume that A has $s \geq 1$ connected components, say $A = A_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup A_s$. We say that A has type $(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)$. We have $5 = \deg(A) = b_1 + \cdots + b_s$. In our case we have $z_{m,d}(P) = 5$ if and only if $b_{m,d}(P) = 5$ and the scheme A evincing the cactus rank is unique ([9, Corollary 2.7] or [4, Lemma 4.2 and text after Remark 2.7]). Therefore if $d \geq 9$ we may define the type of P as the type of A. We prove the following result.

Theorem 1 *Fix integers $m \geq 4$ and $d \geq 9$. Let $P \in \mathbb{P}^r$, $r = \binom{m+d}{m-1}$, be a point with border rank 5. Assume that there is no 3-dimensional linear subspace $H \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ such that $P \in \langle \nu_d(H) \rangle$.*

(i) If P has type $(1;5)$, then $r_{m,d}(P) = 4d - 3$.
(ii) If P has type $(2;3,2)$, then $r_{m,d}(P) = 3d - 1$.
(iii) If P has type $(2;4,1)$, then $r_{m,d}(P) = 3d - 1$.
(iv) If P has type $(3;3,1,1)$, then $r_{m,d}(P) = 2d + 1$.
(v) If P has type $(3;2,2,1)$, then $r_{m,d}(P) = 2d + 1$.
(vi) If P has type $(4;2,1,1,1)$, then $r_{m,d}(P) = d + 3$.
(vii) If P has type $(5;1,1,1,1,1)$, then $r_{m,d}(P) = 5$.

In each case (i),...,(vii) the description of each A easily give the dimension, $5m + 5 - s$, of all points P in that case and that they are parametrized by an irreducible variety (see Remark 8). Each case occurs (Remark 7).

Case (vii) is obvious. Case (i) is the hard one and we use its proof (called step (b) in the proof of Theorem 1) to prove the other cases and (for the easiest cases) more informations that just the integer $r_{m,d}(P)$. For each $P \in \mathbb{P}^r$ let $\mathcal{S}(P)$ be the set of all sets $S \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ evincing the rank of P, i.e. the set of all subset $S \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ such that $P \in \langle \nu_d(S) \rangle$ and $\sharp(S) = r_{m,d}(P)$ (see Proposition 1 (case arbitrary cactus rank $b \geq 2$ and type $(b-1; 2, 1, \dots)$, Proposition 2 (case $s = 3$, $b_1 = b_2 = 2$, $b_3 = 1$), Proposition 3 (case arbitrary cactus rank $b \geq 3$ and type $(b-2; 3, 1, \dots)$ and Proposition 4 (case $s = 2$, $b_1 = 3$, $b_2 = 2$)). In each case P depends on exactly 5 variables, because $P \in \langle \nu_d(A) \rangle$.

Remark 1 If $d \geq 9$, then for each $P \in \mathbb{P}^r$ with border rank 5 there is a unique degree 5 scheme A evincing the cactus rank of P ([9, Corollary 2.7] or [4, Lemma 4.2 and text after Remark 2.7]). Fix any degree 5 zero-dimensional scheme A achieving the cactus rank of some $P \in \mathbb{P}^r$ with border rank 5. Fix any $Q \in \langle \nu_d(A) \rangle$ and let $E \subseteq A$ be a minimal subscheme of A such that $P \in \langle \nu_d(E) \rangle$. If $d \geq 9$ we get that $b_{m,d}(Q) = z_{m,d}(Q) = \deg(E)$ and that E is the only scheme evincing the cactus rank of Q. Q depends essentially on 5 variables if and only if $E = A$ and $\dim(\langle A \rangle) = \mathbb{P}^4$. In each step of the proof of Theorem 1 we give a classification of all A appearing as cactus rank and an easy way to write A. Therefore, using A, one may easily give $P \in \mathbb{P}^r$ with a prescribed rank, among the possible ones $4d - 3$, $3d - 1$, $2d + 1$, $d + 3$, 5. Without knowing A it may be possible to detect the value of $r_{m,d}(P)$ for a specific P, just because Theorem 1 list all possible ranks and the difference between two different ranks is huge for large d.

Remark 2 Take the set-up of Theorem 1, but only assume $d \geq 4$. Fix $P \in \mathbb{P}^r$ with border rank 5 and assume that there is no 3-dimensional linear subspace $H \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ such that $P \in \langle \nu_d(H) \rangle$. Since $d \geq 4$, there is at least one scheme A evincing the cactus rank of P. Call $(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)$, $b_1 + \cdots + b_s = 5$, the type of A. The classification of the possible connected components $A_1, \dots, A_s$ of A is done in the corresponding step of the proof of Theorem 1, because it does not depend on d. At the beginning of each step we prove an upper bound for the integer $r_{m,d}(P)$ (the hard part was then to check the opposite inequality). This part of the inequality does not depend on d. Hence in each case $r_{m,d}(P)$ is at most the value listed in Theorem 1. In particular we get $r_{m,d}(P) \leq 4d-3$.

We work over an algebraically closed field $\mathbb{K}$ with $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{K}) = 0$. Any easy weak form of Lefschetz's principle would allow to deduce this case from the case $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$.

2 Preliminaries

Let X be a projective variety, D an effective Cartier divisor of X and $Z \subset X$ a zero-dimensional scheme. The residual scheme $\mathrm{Res}_D(Z)$ of Z with respect to D (or with respect to the inclusion $D \subset X$) is the closed subscheme of X with $\mathcal{I}_Z : \mathcal{I}_D$ as its ideal sheaf. For every line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ on X we have a residual exact sequence of coherent sheaves

$$0 \to \mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_D(Z)} \otimes \mathcal{L}(-D) \to \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{I}_{Z \cap D} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{|D} \to 0. \tag{1}$$

The case $m = 2$ of the next lemma is a very particular case of [18, Corollaire 2]; the general case easily follows by induction on m, taking a hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ with maximal $\deg(Z \cap H)$ as in step (b) of the proof of Theorem 1 (case $g \leq 2$, $g' = 1$); if $\deg(Z) \leq 2d+1$, then the lemma is [5, Lemma 34].

Lemma 1 *Fix an integer $d \geq 6$. Let $Z \subset \mathbb{P}^m$, $m \geq 2$, be a zero-dimensional scheme with $\deg(Z) \leq 3d+1$ and $h^1(\mathcal{I}_Z(d)) > 0$. Then either there is a line $L \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ with $\deg(L \cap Z) \geq d+1$ or there is a conic $T \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ with $\deg(T \cap Z) \geq 2d+2$ or there is a plane cubic F with $\deg(F \cap Z) \geq 3d$.*

Remark 3 Take the set-up of Lemma 1 and assume the existence of a plane conic T such that $\deg(T \cap Z) \geq 2d+2$, but that there is no line $L \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ with $\deg(L \cap Z) \geq d+2$. When Z has many reduced connected components, it is obvious that T must be reduced. Assume that T is reduced, but reducible, say $T = D \cup R$, with D and R lines. Set $\{o\} := D \cap R$. Since $\deg(D \cap Z) \leq d+1$ and $\deg(R \cap Z) \leq d+1$, we get $\deg(D \cap Z) = \deg(R \cap Z) = d+1$ and that Z is a Cartier divisor of the nodal curve T (it is a general property of nodal curves with smooth irreducible component: for any zero-dimensional scheme $E \subset D \cup R$ we have $\deg(E \cap D) + \deg(E \cap R) - 1 \leq \deg(E) \leq \deg(E \cap D) + \deg(E \cap R)$ and $\deg(E) = \deg(E \cap D) + \deg(E \cap R)$ if and only if E is a Cartier divisor of $D \cup R$). Now assume that existence of a plane cubic F with $\deg(F \cap Z) \geq 3d$. F is not reduced if and only if there is a line $L \subset F$

appearing in F with multiplicity at least two. To get that F is reduced it is sufficient to assume that $\deg(R \cap Z) \leq d+1$ for each line R and that Z has at least $2d+2$ reduced connected components.

Remark 4 Fix integers $m \geq 2$ and $d \geq 3$. Let $Z \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ be a subscheme such that Z spans $\mathbb{P}^m$, $\deg(Z) \leq d+1+m$ and $h^1(\mathcal{I}_Z(d) > 0$. Then $\deg(Z) = d+1+m$ and there is a line $L \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ such that $\deg(Z \cap L) = d+2$ (a quick proof: use induction on m and the proof of Theorem 1 below using the hyperplanes H_i; we get $g \leq 2$).

Remark 5 Let $T \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ be a reduced curve of degree $t < d$. It is connected and the projective space $\langle \nu_d(T)) \rangle$ has dimension $x := \binom{d+2}{2} - \binom{d-t+2}{2} - 1$. Every point of $\langle \nu_d(T) \rangle$ has rank at most x with respect to the curve $\nu_d(T)$ (the proof of [25, Proposition 5.1] works verbatim for reduced and connected curves). Hence $\sharp(B \cap T) \leq x$. If $t = 1$ (resp. $t = 2$, resp $t = 3$) then $x = d$ (resp. $2d$, resp. $3d-1$).

3 Proof of Theorem 1 and related result

Step (b) of the proof of Theorem 1 is by far the most difficult part of this paper and the one which may be used elsewhere. We outline here the proof of Theorem 1 and of the other results of this section.

3.1 Outline of the proof of Theorem 1 and of the other results of this section

We first give the classification of all possible degree 5 schemes A. The key step (called step (b)) is the one in which we handle the case $s = 1$ (it is an enhanced version of the proof of [4, Proposition 5.19]). This step is subdivided into several substeps and sub-substeps (up to, e.g., step (b2.2.2.1), which is the first step of step (b2.2.2), which is the second step of step (b2.2), which is the second step of step (b2), which is the second step of step (b)). There are several good reasons for the splitting of the proof in this way. In the proof of the other cases and in the proof of Propositions 1, 2, 3, 4 we need to quote a specific substep or to modify it a little bit; in this way all proofs are detailed and complete, but with no duplication, and each part of the proof has its own label, making easier to quote it in future works. In step (c) of the proof of Theorem 1 we reduce some cases to Propositions 1, 2, 3 and 4. Proposition 1 covers the case $b_1 = 2$ and $b_2 = b_3 = b_4 = 1$. Proposition 2 covers the case $b_1 = b_2 = 2$ and $b_3 = 1$. Proposition 4 covers the case $b_1 = 3$ and $b_2 = b_3 = 1$. Proposition 3 covers the case $b_1 = 3$ and $b_2 = 2$. In step (d) of the proof of Theorem 1 we prove the case $s = 2$, $b_1 = 4$, $b_2 = 1$(this is far easier than in step (b)). Proposition 1 covers all points P with $b_{m,d}(P) = z_{m,d}(P) = b$ evinced by a scheme of type $(b-1; 2, \dots, 1)$ (it also describes all $B \in \mathcal{S}(P)$, i.e. all sets $S \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ such that $P \in \langle \nu_d(S) \rangle$ and $\sharp(S) = r_{m,d}(P)$). Proposition 2 gives the rank and a description of all $B \in \mathcal{S}(P)$ when $s = 3$, $b_1 = b_2 = 2$

and $b_3 = 1$. Proposition 4 describes the case $s = 2$, $b_1 = 3$, $b_2 = 2$. The proof of Theorem 1 may be seen as an iteration (several times) of the proofs in [4, §5.2].

Proof (Proof of Theorem 1) It is a general result that every zero-dimensional scheme evincing the cactus rank of some $P \in \mathbb{P}^r$ is Gorenstein ([8, Lemma 2.3]). There is a scheme, A, evincing the border rank $b_{m,d}(P)$ of P, because $d \geq b_{m,d}(P) - 1$ ([9, Lemma 2.6]). This scheme is unique, because $d \geq 9 = 2b_{m,d}(P)-1$ ([9, Corollary 2.7 and its proof] or [4, Lemma 4.2 and the text after Remark 2.7]). It also evinces the cactus rank of P, i.e. $z_{m,d}(P) = 5$, because [5] and [4] give the classifications for all points with cactus rank ≤ 4 and they have border rank ≤ 4. Since $P \notin \langle \nu_d(H) \rangle$ for any 3-dimensional linear subspace $H \subset \mathbb{P}^m$, $\deg(A) = 5$ and $P \in \langle \nu_d(A) \rangle$, we have $\dim(\langle A \rangle) = 4$, i.e. A is linearly independent. In particular it is in linearly general position in $\langle A \rangle$. The scheme A is not the double $2O$ of one point of $\langle A \rangle$ (i.e. the closed subscheme of the projective space $\langle A \rangle$ with $(\mathcal{I}_{O,\langle A \rangle})^2$ as its ideal sheaf), because the proof of [5, Theorem 32] shows that for each $P \in \langle \nu_d(2O) \rangle$ there is a line $L \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ such that $P \in \langle \nu_d(L) \rangle$; alternatively, use that A is Gorenstein by [8, Lemma 2.3]. By [17, Theorem 1.3] A is curvilinear.

By assumption A is linearly independent and it spans a 4-dimensional linear subspace of $\mathbb{P}^m$. By concision ([24, Exercise 3.2.2.2]), it is sufficient to do the case $m = 4$. Write $A = A_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup A_s$ with $\deg(A_i) = b_i$, $b_i \geq b_j$ if $i \leq j$, and set $\{O_i\} := (A_1)_{red}$. Since A evinces the cactus rank of P, then $P \notin \langle \nu_d(A') \rangle$ for any $A' \subsetneq A$. Let $B \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ any set evincing the rank of P. Set $W_0 := A \cup B$. If $A \neq B$, then $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{W_0}(d)) > 0$ ([3, Lemma 1]). If $s \neq 5$, then $A \neq B$.

(a) If A is reduced, i.e. if $s = 5$, then $r_{4,d}(P) \leq 5$. Since we assumed border rank 5, we get $r_{4,d}(P) = 5$.

(b) Now assume $s = 1$ and hence $b_1 = 5$. The scheme A_1 is curvilinear and unramified, because $\mathbb{P}^4 = \mathbb{P}(W)$ with $\dim(W) = 5$, $\langle A_1 \rangle = \mathbb{P}^4$ and we may apply [17, Theorem 1.3].

Claim: A_1 is contained in a rational normal curve $C \subset \mathbb{P}^4$.

Proof of the Claim: Since A_1 is connected and curvilinear for each $i = 1, \dots, 5$, A_1 has a unique subscheme $A_1[i]$ of A_1 such that $\deg(A_1[i]) = i$. Since A_1 is linearly independent, then $\dim(\langle A_1[i] \rangle) = i - 1$. For a parametrization $t \mapsto (t, t^2, t^3, t^4)$ of C take the flag of linear subspaces $\langle A_1[1] \rangle \subset \langle A_1[2] \rangle \subset \cdots \subset \langle A_1[5] \rangle$.

The existence of the rational normal curve C also gives that A_1 is unique, up to a projective transformation. The curve $\nu_d(C)$ is a degree $4d$ rational normal curve in its linear span. By Sylvester's theorem ([11], [25, Theorem 4.1], [5, Theorem 23]) the rank of P with respect to $\nu_d(C)$ is $4d - 3$. Hence $r_{4,d}(P) \leq 4d-3$. Assume $\sharp(B) \leq 4d-4$ and hence $\deg(W_0) \leq 4d+1$. Let H_1 be a hyperplane such that $e_1 := \deg(W_0 \cap H_1)$ is maximal. Set $W_1 := \mathrm{Res}_{H_1}(W_0)$. Fix an integer $i \geq 2$ and assume to have defined the integers e_j, the hyperplanes H_j and the scheme W_j, $1 \leq j < i$. Let H_i be any hyperplane such that $e_i := \deg(H_i \cap W_{i-1})$ is maximal. Set $W_i := \mathrm{Res}_{H_i}(W_{i-1})$. We have $e_i \geq e_{i+1}$

for all i. For each integer $i > 0$ we have the residual exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{I}_{W_i}(d-i) \to \mathcal{I}_{W_{i-1}}(d+1-i) \to \mathcal{I}_{W_{i-1}\cap H_i, H_i}(d+1-i) \to 0 \qquad (2)$$

Since $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{W_0}(d)) > 0$, there is an integer $i > 0$ such that $h^1(H_i, \mathcal{I}_{W_{i-1}\cap H_i, H_i}(d+1-i)) > 0$. We call g the minimum such an integer. Since any zero-dimensional scheme with degree 4 of $\mathbb{P}^4$ is contained in a hyperplane, if $e_i \le 3$, then $W_i = \emptyset$ and $e_j = 0$ if $j > i$. Hence $e_{d+2} = 0$ and $e_{d+1} \le 1$. Since $h^1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(d)) = h^1(\mathcal{I}_Q) = 0$ for any $Q \in \mathbb{P}^4$, we get $g \le d$. By [5, Lemma 34] either $e_g \ge 2(d+1-g)+2$ or there is a line $L \subset H_g$ such that $\deg(L \cap W_{i-1}) \ge d+3-g$. Assume for the moment $g \ge 2$ and $e_g \le 2(d+1-g)+1$. Since $e_g > 0$, W_{g-2} spans $\mathbb{P}^4$. Hence $e_{g-1} \ge d+5-g$. This inequality is obvious if $e_g \ge 2(d+1-g)+2$ and $g \le d-1$, because $2(d+1-g)+2 \ge d+5-g$ if $g \le d-1$. Now assume $g = d$; if $e_d \le 4$ and there is no line $L \subset H_d$ with $\deg(L \cap W_{d-1}) \ge 3$, then $e_d = 4$ and $W_{d-1} \cap H_d$ is contained in a plane; hence even in this case we get $e_{g-1} \ge 5 = d+5-g$. Hence if $g \ge 2$, then $e_{g-1} \ge d+5-g$. Since $e_i \ge e_{i+1}$ for all i, we get that $4d+1 \ge \deg(W_0) \ge g(d+5-g)-2$. Set $\psi(t) = t(d+5-t)-2$. The function $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is increasing if $t \le (d+5)/2$, decreasing if $t \ge (d+5)/2$ and strictly monotone in any interval not containing $(d+5)/2$. Since $\psi(4) = 4d+2 > 4d+1$ and $\psi(d) = 5d-2 > 4d+1$, we get $1 \le g \le 3$.

(b1) Assume $g = 3$. We have $e_3 \ge d$ and $e_1 \ge e_2 \ge d+2$. Hence $\deg(W_3) \le d-3$ and $e_1 \le 2d-1$. Since $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{W_4}(d-3)) = 0$, [4, Lemma 5.1] gives $W_0 \subset H_1 \cup H_2 \cup H_3$. Since $e_1 \ge e_2 \ge e_3$ and $e_1+e_2+e_3 \le 4d+1$, we have $e_3 \le (4d+1)/3 \le 2(d-2)+1$. By [5, Lemma 34] there is a line $L \subset H_3$ such that $\deg(L \cap W_3) \ge d$. Taking instead of H_3 any hyperplane $M \subset L$ we get $W_0 \subset H_1 \cup H_2 \cup M$. In particular we have $B \subset H_1 \cup H_2 \cup L$. Since A is curvilinear, we even get $W_0 \subset H_1 \cup H_2 \cup L$. Set $Z_0 := W_0$. Let $N_1 \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be a hyperplane containing L and such that $f_1 := \deg(W_0 \cap N_1)$ is maximal among the hyperplanes containing L. We have $f_1 \ge e_3 + 2 \ge d+2$. Set $Z_1 := \mathrm{Res}_{N_1}(Z_0)$. Let $N_2 \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be a hyperplane such that $f_2 := \deg(N_2 \cap Z_1)$ is maximal. Set $Z_2 := \mathrm{Res}_{N_2}(Z_1)$. For any integer $i \ge 3$ let $N_i \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be a hyperplane such that $f_i := \deg(Z_{i-1} \cap N_i)$ is maximal. Set $Z_i := \mathrm{Res}_{N_i}(Z_{i-1})$. Let g' be the minimal positive integer i such that $h^1(N_i, \mathcal{I}_{N_i \cap Z_{i-1}, N_i}(d+1-i)) > 0$ (it exists by the residual exact sequence (2) obtained using the hyperplanes N_i). Now we only have that $f_i \ge f_{i+1}$ if $i \ge 2$, but we also have $\deg(Z_0) - f_1 \le 3d-1$. Hence $g' \le 3$.

(b1.1) Assume $g' = 3$. We have $f_3 \le (3d-1)/2 \le 2(d-2)+1$. Hence there is a line $R \subset N_3$ such that $\deg(R \cap Z_2) \ge d$. Since $B \cap L \cap W_1 = \emptyset$, we have $R \ne L$. Set $Z'_0 := Z_0$. Take any hyperplane N'_1 containing $L \cup R$ and with $f'_i := \deg(N'_1 \cap Z_0)$ maximal among the hyperplanes containing $L \cup R$. Set $Z'_1 := \mathrm{Res}_{N'_1}(Z'_0)$. Define as above the integers f'_i, the hyperplanes N'_i and the schemes W'_i with $f'_i \ge f'_{i+1}$ for all $i \ge 2$ and $f'_1 \ge 2d-1$. Let g'' be the minimal positive integer i such that $h^1(N'_i, \mathcal{I}_{N'_i \cap Z'_{i-1}, N'_i}(d+1-i)) > 0$ (it exists by the residual exact sequence (2) obtained using the hyperplanes N'_i). Since $f'_1 \ge 2d-1$, we have $g'' \le 2$.

(b1.1.1) Assume for the moment $g'' = 2$. We get $f_2' \geq d+1$ and the existence of a line $D \subset N_2'$ such that $\deg(D \cap Z_2') \geq d+1$ ([5, Lemma 34]).

First assume that $L \cup D \cup R$ is contained in a hyperplane M. In this case we get $e_1 \geq \deg(M \cap W_0) \geq 3d-1$. Hence $e_3+e_2 \leq d+2$, a contradiction. Now assume that $L \cup D \cup R$ is not contained in a hyperplane. Since $h^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^4}(2)) = 15$ and $h^0(\mathcal{O}_{L\cup R\cup D}(2)) \leq 9$, we have $h^0(\mathcal{I}_{L\cup R\cup D}(2)) \geq 6$. Since $L \cup D \cup R$ is not contained in a hyperplane, either these lines are pairwise disjoint and they are not contained in a plane or two of them meets and the other one is disjoint from the plane spanned by the first two lines. Therefore $L \cup R \cup D$ is the scheme-theoretic base locus of $|\mathcal{I}_{L\cup R\cup D}(2)|$. Let Q be a general hyperquadric containing $L \cup D \cup R$. A dimensional count gives that Q is irreducible. First assume $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)}(d-2)) = 0$. By [4, Lemma 5.1] we get $A \cup B \subset Q$. Since $L \cup R \cup D$ is the scheme-theoretic base locus of $|\mathcal{I}_{L\cup R\cup D}(2)|$ and A is curvilinear, we get $A \subset L \cup R \cup D$, contradicting the fact that at most two of these lines contain O.

Now assume $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)}(d-2)) > 0$. Since $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)) \leq d+2$, we get the existence of a line R' such $\deg(R' \cap \mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)) \geq d$. We have $h^0(\mathcal{I}_{L\cup D\cup R\cup R'}(2)) \geq 3$ and we take a general $Q_1 \in |\mathcal{I}_{L\cup R'\cup R\cup D}(2)|$. As above we find $A \cup B \subset Q_1$. Since $e_1 \leq 2d-1$, no 3 of the lines L, R, R' and D are contained in a plane. Hence at most two of these lines contain O and at most one of the lines is tangent to C at O. We get $\deg(B) \geq -3 + \deg(W_0 \cap L) + \deg(W_0 \cap R) + \deg(W_0 \cap R') + \deg(W_0 \cap D) \geq -3+d+d+d+1+d = 4d-2$, a contradiction.

(b1.1.2) Now assume $g'' = 1$. Since A is connected and not contained in a hyperplane, [4, Lemma 5.1] gives $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{Z_1'}(d-1)) > 0$. We have $\deg(Z_1') \leq 3d-1$. By Lemma 1 either there is a line $R \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ such that $\deg(R \cap Z_1') \geq d+1$ or there is a reduced conic $T \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ such that $\deg(T \cap Z_1') \geq 2d$. In the latter case we would have $e_1 \geq 2d+1$, a contradiction. Hence there is a line $R \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ such that $\deg(R \cap Z_1') \geq d+1$. Since $R \cap (B \setminus R \cap L) \supseteq R \cap (B \setminus B \cap N_1') \neq \emptyset$, then $R \neq L$ and hence at most one of the lines R, L is tangent to C at O. If $O \notin (L \cap R)$, then $\deg(W_0 \cap (L \cup R)) \geq 2d$ and hence $e_1 \geq 2d$, a contradiction. Now assume $O \in (L \cap R)$. At most one of the lines L, R is tangent to C at O. We get $\deg(W_0 \cap (L \cup R)) \geq 2d-1$. By concision ([24, Exercise 3.2.2.2]) B spans $\mathbb{P}^4$. Hence there is a hyperplane $M \supset L \cup R$ containing a point of $B \setminus B \cap (L \cup R)$. Hence $e_1 \geq 2d$, a contradiction.

(b1.2) Assume $g' = 2$. Since $f_2 \leq e_1 \leq 2d-1$, there is a line $R \subset N_2$ such that $\deg(R \cap Z_1) \geq d+1$. Since $R \cap (B \setminus B \cap L) \subseteq R \cap B \cap Z_1$ and $\deg(R \cap B \cap Z_1) \leq \deg(R \cap (B \setminus B \cap L)) + \deg(R \cap A) \leq \deg(R \cap (B \setminus B \cap L)) + 2$, we get $R \neq L$ and hence $e_1 \geq -1 + \deg(L \cap W_0) + \deg(R \cap W_0) \geq 2d$, a contradiction.

(b2) Assume $g = 2$. Since $e_2 \leq e_1$ and $e_1 + e_2 \leq 4d+1$, we have $e_2 \leq 2d$. By Lemma 1 either there is a line $L \subset H_2$ such that $\deg(L \cap W_1) \geq d+1$ or $e_2 = 2d$ and there is a conic $T \subset H_2$ such that $W_1 \cap H_2 \subset T$, but there is no line $L \subset T$ with $\deg(L \cap W_0) \geq d+1$; in the latter case T is reduced and if T is reducible, then $\deg(J \cap W_1) = d$ for every component of T (Remark 3).

(b2.1) Assume $e_2 = 2d$ and the existence of a conic $T \subset H_2$ such that $W_1 \cap H_2 \subset T$. Since A spans $\mathbb{P}^4$, then $A \nsubseteq T$ and hence $O \in T$. Since B spans $\mathbb{P}^4$ ([24, Exercise 3.2.2.2]), there is $o \in B \setminus B \cap \langle T \rangle$. Let M be the plane spanned by o and T. Since $e_1 \leq 2d+1$, we get $e_1 = 2d+1$, $\sharp(B) = 4d-4$, $O \notin B$ and that $W_0 \cap M = \{o\} \sqcup (W_1 \cap T)$ with $\deg(W_1 \cap T) = 2d$. Therefore $B = (B \cap H_1) \sqcup (B \cap T)$ and no point of $B \cap H_1$ is contained in the plane $\langle T \rangle$. Since $A \nsubseteq M$, [4, Lemma 5.1] gives $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)}(d-1)) > 0$. Lemma 1 and Remark 3 give that either there is a line R with $\deg(R \cap \mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) \geq d+1$ or $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) = 2d$ and $\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)$ is contained in a reduced conic T'. The plane M and hence R or T depends on the choice of o (call them M_o, R_o, T_o).

(b2.1.1) First assume that $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) = 2d$ and that $\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)$ is contained in a reduced conic T', but there is no line R with $\deg(R \cap \mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) \geq d+1$; hence if T' is reducible, then $\deg(J \cap \mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) = d$ for each component of T' and the singular point of T' is not contained in $\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)$. Fix $q \in T' \cap B$ and take the hyperplane $M_q := \langle \{q\} \cup T \rangle$. We have $\mathrm{Res}_{M_q}(B) = ((T' \cap B) \setminus \{q\}) \sqcup \{o\}$. This set is not contained in a line (even if T' is reducible), because $d \geq 9$. This set is contained in a conic only if $o \in T'$. Hence (applying [4, Lemma 5.1] to M_q) we get $B \subset T \cup T'$. As in step (b2.1) we have $O \in T'$. Hence $O \in T \cap T'$. If one of the two conics is reducible, then taking a connected union $J \subset T \cup T'$ of 3 lines we get $e_1 \geq 2d+2$, a contradiction. Hence both conics T, T' are smooth. Since $\langle B \rangle = \mathbb{P}^4$, we have $\langle T \rangle \cap \langle T' \rangle = \{O\}$. Hence at most one of the two conics is tangent to C at O. If T' is not tangent to C at O we get $\sharp(B \cap T) \geq 2d-2$ and $\sharp(B \cap T') \geq 2d-1$, a contradiction (and similarly if T is not tangent to C at O).

(b2.1.2) Now assume the existence of the line R. Since $e_1 = 2d+1$, then $T \cup R$ spans $\mathbb{P}^4$, i.e. $R \cap \langle T \rangle = \emptyset$. In particular $O \notin R \cap T$. First assume $O \notin R$. We have $\sharp(B \cap R) = d+1$, contradicting the case $t = 1$ of Remark 5. Now assume $O \notin T$ and hence $\sharp(B \cap T) = 2d$. Since $O \in R$, we get $O \notin \langle R \rangle$ and either $\sharp(B \cap (R \setminus \{O\})) = d$ or R is the tangent line to C at O. Since $h^0(\mathcal{I}_{T \cup R}(2)) = 7$, there is $Q \in |\mathcal{I}_{T \cup R}(2)|$ with $\deg(Q \cap W_0) \geq 3d+2$ (e.g., if R is not tangent to C at O it is sufficient to take Q containing $R \cup T$ and the degree two zero-dimensional subscheme η of A). Since $\deg(Q \cap \mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)) \leq d-1$, we have $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)}(d-2)) = 0$ and hence $Q \supset W_0$ ([4, Lemma 5.1]), while we may even find $Q \in |\mathcal{I}_{T \cup R \cup \eta}(2)|$ not containing the degree 4 subscheme of A, because A is curvilinear.

(b2.2) Assume the existence of a line $L \subset H_2$ such that $\deg(L \cap W_1) \geq d+1$. The case $t = 1$ of Remark 5 gives $O \in L$, $d-1 \leq \sharp(B \cap L) \leq d$ and that $\sharp(B \cap L) = d$ and $O \notin B$ if L is not the tangent line to C at O. Let $N_1 \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be a hyperplane containing L and such that $f_1 := \deg(W_0 \cap L)$ is maximal among the hyperplanes containing L. Since A spans $\mathbb{P}^4$, we have $f_1 \geq d+3$ and hence $e_1 \geq d+3$. Set $Z_0 := W_0$ and $Z_1 := \mathrm{Res}_{N_1}(Z_0)$. Let N_2 be a hyperplane such that $f_2 := \deg(N_2 \cap Z_1)$. Set $Z_1 := \mathrm{Res}_{N_2}(Z_1)$. Define inductively the hyperplane N_i, $i \geq 3$, the schemes $Z_i := \mathrm{Res}_{N_i}(Z_{i-1})$ and the integer $f_i := \deg(N_i \cap Z_{i-1})$ with f_i maximal among all hyperplanes. We have $f_i \geq f_{i+1}$ for all $i \geq 3$ and if $f_i \leq 3$, then $f_{i+1} = 0$ and $Z_i = \emptyset$.

We have the residual exact sequence similar to (2) with N_i instead of H_i, Z_{i-1} instead of W_{i-1} and Z_i instead of W_i. Hence there is an integer $i > 0$ such that $h^1(N_i, \mathcal{I}_{N_i \cap Z_{i-1}, H_i}(d+1-i)) > 0$ and we call g' the first such an integer. Since $\sum_{i \geq 2} f_i \leq 3d-2$ and $f_{i+1} = 0$ if $f_i \leq 3$, we have $g' \leq d+1$. Assume for the moment $g' \leq d+1$. Hence either $f_{g'} \geq 2(d+1-g')+2$ or there is a line $R \subset N_{g'}$ such that $\deg(R \cap Z_{i-1}) \geq d+3-g'$. Assume for the moment $3 \leq g' \leq d$. We get $f_{g'-1} \geq d+5-g'$ ([5, Lemma 34]). Hence $3d-2 \geq \sum_{i \geq 2} f_i \geq (g'-1)(d+5-g')-1$. As in step (b) we also exclude the case $g' = d$. We get $g' \leq 3$ if $g \leq d$.

Now assume $g' = d+1$, i.e. assume $\deg(W_2) \geq 2$. Since $f_1 \geq d+3$ and $f_i \geq 4$ for $2 \leq i \leq d$, we get $4d+1 \geq d+3+4(d-1)+2$, a contradiction.

(b2.2.1) Assume $g' = 3$. Since $f_1 \geq d+3$, $f_2 \geq f_3$ and $f_1+f_2+f_3 \leq 4d+1$, we get $f_3 \leq (3d-2)/2 \geq 2(d-2)+1$ (since $d \geq 4$). By [5, Lemma 34] there is a line $R \subset N_3$ such that $\deg(R \cap Z_2) \geq d$. Since $f_3 > 0$, we also see that Z_1 spans $\mathbb{P}^4$. Hence $f_2 \geq d+2$. Therefore $f_1 \leq 2d-1$. Let M_1 be a hyperplane containing $L \cup R$ and with $h_1 := \deg(M_1 \cap 0)$ maximal. We have $f_1 \geq h_1$. If $L \cap R = \emptyset$, then $h_1 \geq \deg(L \cap W_0) + \deg(R \cap W_0) \geq 2d+1$, a contradiction. Now assume $L \cap R \neq \emptyset$. We have $R \neq L$, because $R \cap (B \setminus B \cap L) \neq \emptyset$. Since $L \cap R$ is scheme-theoretically a point, we have $\deg(W_0 \cap (L \cup R)) \geq \deg(W_0 \cap L) + \deg(W_0 \cap R) - 1$. Hence $h_1 \geq 1 + \deg(W_0 \cap L) + \deg(W_0 \cap R) - 1 \geq 2d$, a contradiction.

(b2.2.2) Assume $g' = 2$. Since $e_2 \geq d+1$, we have $e_1 \leq 3d$. Since $f_1 \geq d+3$, we have $f_2 \leq 3d-2 = 3(d-1)+1$. By Lemma 1 and Remark 3 either there is a line $R \subset N_2$ with $\deg(R \cap Z_1) \geq d+1$ or there is a reduced conic $T \subset N_2$ with $\deg(Z_2 \cap T) \geq 2d$ or there is reduced plane cubic $F \subset N_2$ with $\deg(F \cap N_2) \geq 3d-3$.

(b2.2.2.1) Assume the existence of a reduced plane cubic $F \subset N_2$ with $\deg(F \cap N_2) \geq 3d-3$ and take any hyperplane M containing F and another point of B (it exists, because $\langle B \rangle = \mathbb{P}^4$ by [24, Exercise 3.2.2.2]). By [4, Lemma 5.1] we have $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)}(d-1)) > 0$. Since $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) \leq d+4 \leq 2(d-1)+1$ ($d \geq 5$), there is a line $R \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ such that $\deg(R \cap \mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) \geq d+1$. The case $t = 1$ of Remark 5 implies $O \in R$. Since $\deg(R \cap A) \leq 2$, we have $\sharp(B \setminus B \cap M) \geq d-1$ with equality only if R is the tangent line of C at O. Assume for the moment $O \notin F$. We get $\sharp(B \cap M) \geq 1 + \sharp(B \cap F) \geq 3d-2$ and hence $\sharp(N) \geq 3d-3$, a contradiction. Now assume $O \in F$. Since $\langle F \cup R \rangle \neq \mathbb{P}^4$, we get $e_1 \geq (3d-3)+d-1$, a contradiction.

(b2.2.2.2) Assume the existence of a reduced conic $T \subset N_2$ with $\deg(Z_2 \cap T) \geq 2d$; if T is reducible also assume that $\deg(J \cap Z_2) = d$ for every component J of T (Remark 1). First assume that L is an irreducible component of T; since $L \subset N_1$, we have $\deg(L \cap Z_1) \leq \deg(L \cap A) \leq 2$, a contradiction. Now assume that L is not an irreducible component of T, but that $L \subset \langle T \rangle$; this case is done as in step (b2.2.2.1). Now assume $L \cap \langle T \rangle = \emptyset$ and hence $O \notin \langle T \rangle$. Let Q be a quadric hypersurface containing $T \cup L$ and at least one other point of B (it exists, because $h^0(\mathcal{I}_{L \cup T}(2)) = 7$. Since $\deg(W_0) - \deg(W_0 \cap Q) \leq d-2$, then $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)}(d-2)) = 0$ and hence [4, Lemma 5.1] gives $W_0 \subset Q$. Hence $h^0(\mathcal{I}_{A \cup L \cup T}(2)) \geq 6$. Since $O \notin \langle T \rangle$, we have $h^0(\mathcal{I}_{A \cup T}(2)) = 5$, a contradiction.

Now assume $L \cap \langle T \rangle \neq \emptyset$ and call N any hyperplane containing $T \cup L$. Either by a residual exact sequence (case $h^1(N, \mathcal{I}_{W_0 \cap N}(d)) = 0$) or quoting [4, Lemma 5.1] we get $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_N(W_0)}(d-1)) > 0$. Since $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_N(W_0)) \leq d+1$, there is a line $R \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ such that $\deg(R \cap \mathrm{Res}_N(W_0)) \geq d+1$. We have $L \neq R$. Remark 5 gives $O \in R$ and $\sharp(R \cap (B \setminus N)) \geq d-1$ with strict inequality, unless $\sharp(B \cap L) = d$. Let Q be any quadric surface containing the two conics $L \cup R$ and T (it exists, because $h^0(\mathcal{I}_{L \cup R \cup T}(2)) \geq 5$). Since $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)) \leq 5$, we have $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_{Q(W_0)}}(d-2)) = 0$ and hence [4, Lemma 5.1] gives $W_0 \subset Q$. Since A is curvilinear, we get $A \cup B \subset L \cup R \cup T$. Since $A \subset B \cup L \cup R \cup T$, the reduced conic must be reducible and the four lines of $L \cup R \cup T$ pass through the point O_1. Moreover, the union of any 3 of these lines span a hyperplane. Write $L \cup R \cup T = L_1 \cup L_2 \cup L_3 \cup L_4$ with each L_i a line. We have $\sharp(B \cap (L_i \setminus \{O_1\})) + 1 \leq \deg(L_i \deg(L_i \cap W_0) \leq \sharp(B \cap (L_i \setminus \{O_1\})) + 2$ and the second inequality is not strict if and only if L_i is the tangent line of C. Hence the second inequality is not strict for at most one index i. If $T = L_i \cup L_j$ we also have $\deg(T \cap W_0) \leq \deg(T \cap L_i) + \deg(L_j \cap W_0)$. We get $\sharp(B \setminus \{O_1\}) \geq -5 + (d+1) + (d+1) + 2d = 4d - 3$, a contradiction.

(b2.2.3) Assume $g' = 1$.

(b2.2.3.1) Assume $\deg(L \cap W_0) \geq d+2$. By the case $t = 1$ of Remark 5 we have $\sharp(B \cap L) = d$, $O \notin B$ and L is the tangent line to C at O. The maximality property of N_1 implies $f_1 \geq d+4$ and hence $\deg(Z_1) \leq 3d-3$. Since $W_0 \nsubseteq N_1$, then $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{Z_1}(d-1)) > 0$. By Lemma 1 and Remark 3 either there is a line $R \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ with $\deg(R \cap Z_1) \geq d+1$ or there is a reduced conic $T \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ with $\deg(Z_1 \cap T) \geq 2d$ (if T is reducible we may also assume $\deg(J \cap W_0) = d$ for each irreducible component J of T) or there is reduced plane cubic $F \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ with $\deg(F \cap Z_1) \geq 3d-3$.

(b2.2.3.1.1) Assume the existence of F. In particular we have $e_1 \geq 3d-2$. Fix any plane $M \supset L$. Since $\deg((H_1 \cap M) \cap W_0) \geq 4d-1$, we have $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_{H_1 \cup M}(W_0)}(d-2)) = 0$ and hence $W_0 \subset H_1 \cup N$. Recall that in this step L is the tangent line to C at O. Set $c := \deg(A \cap H_1)$. Since $L \notin H_1$, we have $c \leq 1$. Since $A \subset H_1 \cup N$ for each hyperplane containing L, we get $c+2 \geq 5$, a contradiction.

(b2.2.3.1.2) Assume the existence of T. Since $L \subset N_1$ and $\deg(J \cap Z_1) > \deg(J \cap A)$ for any line $J \subset T$, the set $T \cap L$ is finite. Assume for the moment $L \subset \langle T \rangle$. Since $\deg(W_0 \cap \langle T \rangle) \geq d + \deg(T \cap Z_1) \geq 3d$, we get $e_1 \geq 3d+1$ and hence $e_2 \leq d$, a contradiction. Now assume $L \nsubseteq \langle T \rangle$ and $L \cap \langle T \rangle \neq \emptyset$. Let M be the hyperplane spanned by $L \cup T$. Since $\langle T \rangle$ does not contain the tangent line, L, of C at O, we have $\deg(A \cap T) \leq 1$. Hence $\sharp(B \cap (M \setminus \{O\})) \geq 3d-1$. Hence $e_1 \geq 3d$, a contradiction.

Now assume $L \cap \langle T \rangle = \emptyset$. We have $\deg(W_0 \cap (L \cup T)) \geq 3d+2$. Since $O \in L$, we have $T \cap A = \emptyset$ and hence $A \nsubseteq T \cup L$. We have $h^0(\mathcal{I}_{L \cup T}(2)) = 7$ and $T \cup L$ is the scheme-theoretic base locus of $|\mathcal{I}_{L \cup T}(2)|$. Fix any $Q \in |\mathcal{I}_{L \cup T}(2)|$. Since $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)) \leq d-1$, we have $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_{Q(W_0)}}(d-2)) = 0$ and hence $W_0 \subset Q$. Moving Q in $|\mathcal{I}_{L \cup T}(2)|$ we get $W_0 \subset L \cup T$, a contradiction.

(b2.2.3.1.3) Assume the existence of R. Since $R \neq L$ and L is the tangent line to C at O, Remark 5 gives $O \in R$ and $\sharp(B \cap (R \setminus \{O\}) = d$. Let $M \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be a hyperplane containing $R \cup L$ and with maximal $\deg(M \cap W_0)$. Since $A \nsubseteq M$, we have $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)}(d-1)) > 0$ ([4, Lemma 5.1]). Since $h \geq 1 + \deg(W_0 \cap \langle R \cup L \rangle) \geq 2d+3$, we have $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) \leq 2d-2$. Hence there is a line $D \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ such that $\deg(D \cap \mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) \geq d+1$. Since $L \cup R \subset M$, then $D \cap (B \setminus B \cap M) \neq \emptyset$ and in particular $D \neq L$ and $D \neq L$. Since L is the tangent line to C at O, Remark 5 gives $O \in D$ and $\sharp(B \cap (D \setminus \{O\})) = d$. Let N be a hyperplane containing $D \cup R \cup L$. We have $\deg(N \cap W_0) \geq 3d+2$ and hence $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_N(W_0)}(d-1)) = 0$. Hence $A \subset N$, a contradiction.

(b2.2.3.2) Assume $\deg(L \cap W_0) = d+1$. By [5, Lemma 34] we have $f_1 \geq 2d+2$. Since $W_0 \nsubseteq N_1$, we have $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{Z_1}(d-1)) > 0$ ([4, Lemma 5.1]). Since $\deg(Z_1) \leq 4d+1-f_1 \leq 2(d-1)+1$, there is a line $R \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ such that $\deg(R \cap Z_1) \geq d+1$. The case $t=1$ of Remark 5 gives $O \in R$. Since $L \subset N_1$ and $d+1 \geq 3$, we have $R \cap (B \setminus B \cap L) \neq \emptyset$ and hence $L \neq R$. Let M be the hyperplane containing $L \cup R$ and with maximal $g_1 := \deg(M \cap W_0)$. Since $\langle R \cup L \rangle$ is a plane, we have $g_1 \geq 1 + \deg(W_0 \cap \langle L \cup R \rangle) \geq 2d$. Since $W_0 \nsubseteq M$, we get $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)}(d-1)) > 0$. Since $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) \leq 2d+1$, either there is a line $D \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ with $\deg(D \cap \mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) \geq d+1$ or there is a conic $T \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ with $\deg(T \cap \mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) \geq 2d$.

(b2.2.3.2.1) Assume the existence of T. First, assume $L \subset \langle T \rangle$. Since $\deg(W_0 \cap \langle T \rangle) \geq d + \deg(T \cap Z_1) \geq 3d$, we get $e_1 \geq 3d+1$ and hence $e_2 \leq d$, a contradiction. Now, assume $L \nsubseteq \langle T \rangle$ and $L \cap \langle T \rangle \neq \emptyset$. Let M be the hyperplane spanned by $L \cup T$. Since $\langle T \rangle$ does not contain the tangent line, L, of C at O, we have $\deg(A \cap T) \leq 1$. Hence $\sharp(B \cap (M \setminus \{O\})) \geq 3d-1$. Hence $e_1 \geq 3d$, a contradiction. Now, assume $L \cap \langle T \rangle = \emptyset$. We have $\deg(W_0 \cap (L \cup T)) \geq 3d+1$. Since $O \in L$, we have $T \cap A = \emptyset$ and hence $A \nsubseteq T \cup L$. We have $h^0(\mathcal{I}_{L \cup T}(2)) = 7$ and $T \cup L$ is the scheme-theoretic base locus $|\mathcal{I}_{L \cup T}(2)|$. Fix any $Q \in |\mathcal{I}_{L \cup T}(2)|$. Since $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)) \leq d$, either $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)}(d-2)) = 0$ or $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)) = d$ and there is a line $J \supset \mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)$. In the former case we have $W_0 \subset Q$ and hence $W_0 \subset L \cup T$, a contradiction. Now assume $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)) = d$ and $J \supset \mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)$ for some line J. Since $\deg(A \cap J) \leq 2$, we have $J \cap (B \setminus B \cap Q) \neq \emptyset$. Hence $J \neq L$ and J is not a component of T. Since $L \cap \langle T \rangle = \emptyset$, we have $\sharp(B \cap (L \cup T \cup J)) \geq d-1+2d+d-2$, a contradiction.

(b2.2.3.2.2) Assume the existence of D. Remark 5 gives $O \in D \cap L$. Since $f_1 \leq e_1 \leq 3d$ and $g' = 1$, either there is a line $R' \subset N_1$ with $\deg(R' \cap Z_0) \geq d+2$ or there is a conic $T' \subset N_1$ with $\deg(Z_0 \cap T') \geq 2d+2$ or there is a plane cubic $F' \subset N_1$ with $\deg(Z_0 \cap F') \geq 3d$ (Lemma 1). The last case cannot occur, because it would give $f_1 \geq 3d+1$ and hence $e_1 \geq 3d+1$.

(b2.2.3.2.2.1) Assume the existence of R'. Remark 5 gives that R' is the tangent line of C at O. Since $\deg(L \cap W_0) = d+1$, we have $R' \neq L$. Since $R' \subset N_1$ and $D \cap (B \setminus B \cap N_1) \neq \emptyset$, we get $D \neq R'$. Remark 5 gives $O \in R'$ and that R' is the tangent line of C at O. Let $M \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be any hyperplane containing $D \cup L \cup R'$. Since at most one of the lines L, D, R' is tangent to

C at O, we have $\sharp((B \setminus \{O\}) \cap M) \geq 3d$ and $e_1 \geq \deg(W_0 \cap M) \geq 3d+2$, a contradiction.

(b2.2.3.2.2.2) Assume the existence of T'. If $O \notin T'$, then we get $\sharp(B \cap (T' \cup L \cup R)) \geq 4d-2$, a contradiction. Hence $O \in T'$. Since $\sharp(B) \leq 4d-4$, we also get that $\langle T' \rangle$ contains the tangent line to C at O. We have $\sharp(B \cap (T \setminus \{O\})) \geq 2d-3$. If either $L \subset \langle T' \rangle$ or $R \subset \langle T \rangle$, then we get $e_1 > \deg(W_0 \cap \langle T \rangle) \geq 3d$, a contradiction. If $L \nsubseteq \langle T' \rangle$ and $R \nsubseteq \langle T \rangle$, then neither L nor R is tangent to C at O and hence $\sharp((B \setminus \{O\}) \cap R) \geq d$ and $\sharp((B \setminus \{O\}) \cap L) \geq d$. Therefore $\sharp(B \setminus \{O\}) \geq 4d-3$, a contradiction.

(b3) Assume $g = 1$. Since $A \nsubseteq H_1$, [4, Lemma 5.1] gives $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{W_1}(d-1)) > 0$ and in particular $\deg(W_1) \geq d+1$. Hence $e_1 \leq 3d$. By Lemma 1 and Remark 3 either there is a line $L \subset H_1$ such that $\deg(L \cap W_0) \geq d+2$ or there is a reduced conic $T \subset H_1$ such that $\deg(T \cap W_0) \geq 2d+2$ or there is a plane cubic $F \subset H_1$ with $\deg(W_0 \cap F) \geq 3d$.

(b3.1) Assume the existence of F. Since A spans $\mathbb{P}^4$, we get $e_1 > \deg(F \cap W_0) \geq 3d$, a contradiction.

(b3.2) Assume the existence of T. Since T is a plane curve, we have $\deg(T \cap A) \leq 3$ and hence $\sharp(T \cap (B \setminus \{O\}) \geq 2d-1$. Remark 5 for $t = 2$ gives $O \in T$ and that T and C have the same tangent line at O. Since $A \nsubseteq H_1$, [4, Lemma 5.1] gives $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{W_1}(d-1)) > 0$ and hence $e_1 \leq 4d+1-\deg(W_1) \leq 3d$. Since A spans $\mathbb{P}^4$, we get $e_1 > \deg(W_0 \cap T)$. Hence $\deg(W_1) \leq 2d-2$. Therefore there is a line $R \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ such that $\deg(R \cap W_1) \geq d+1$. Since $R \cap (B \setminus B \cap H_1) \neq \emptyset$, we have $R \nsubseteq H_1$ and in particular $R \nsubseteq \langle T \rangle$. Hence R is not tangent to C at O. Remark 5 gives $O \in R$ and $\sharp(R \cap (B \setminus \{O\})) = d$. Hence $M := \langle T \cup R \rangle$ is a hyperplane, $e_1 \geq \deg(M \cap W_0) \geq \deg(T \cap W_0) + \sharp(R \cap (B \setminus \{O\})) \geq 3d+2$, a contradiction.

(b3.3) Assume the existence of L. Since A spans $\mathbb{P}^4$ we have $e_1 \geq d+4$. Remark 5 gives $O \in L$, that L is the tangent line of C at O and that $\sharp(B \cap (L \setminus \{O\})) = d$ (it also gives $O \notin B$). Since $A \nsubseteq H_1$, [4, Lemma 5.1] gives $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{W_1}(d-1)) > 0$. We have $e_1 + \deg(W_1) \leq 4d+1$ and in particular $\deg(W_1) \leq 3d-3$. Lemma 1 gives either the existence of a line $R \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ with $\deg(R \cap W_1) \geq d+1$ or the existence of a conic $T' \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ with $\deg(T' \cap W_1) \geq 2d$ or the existence of a plane cubic F with $\deg(F \cap W_1) \geq 3d-3$. The latter case is impossible, because it would give $e_1 \geq 3d-2$ and hence $\deg(W_1) \leq d+4$. Since $\deg(W_1) \geq d+1$, then $e_1 \leq 3d$.

(b3.3.1) Assume the existence of the line R. Since $R \cap (B \setminus B \cap H_1) \neq \emptyset$, we have $R \nsubseteq H_1$ and hence $R \neq L$. Since L is the tangent line of C at O, we have $\deg(R \cap A) \leq 1$. Remark 5 gives $O \in R$, $O \notin B$ and $\sharp(B \cap R) = d$. Let $M \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be a hyperplane containing $R \cup L$ and with maximal $h := \deg(M \cap W_0)$. Since $A \nsubseteq M$, we have $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)}(d-1)) > 0$. We have $h \geq 2d+3$ and hence $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) \leq 2d-2$. Therefore there is a line $D \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ such that $\deg(D \cap \mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) \geq d+1$. Since $D \cap (B \setminus B \cap M) \neq \emptyset$, we have $D \nsubseteq \langle R \cup L \rangle$. Since L is the tangent line of C at O, Remark 5 gives $O \in D$ and $\sharp(D \cap B) = d$. Let N be the hyperplane spanned by $D \cup R \cup L$. Since $O \notin B$, we

have $e_1 \geq \deg(M \cap W_0) \geq d+2+d+d$, contradicting the inequality $e_1 \leq 3d$ proved in step (b3.3).

(b3.3.2) Assume the existence of the conic T' but the non-existence of any line R with $\deg(R \cap W_1) \geq d$. If T is reducible, then $\deg(J \cap W_1) = d$ for each component J of T' (Remark 3). Since A spans $\mathbb{P}^4$, we have $e_1 > \deg(T' \cap W_1)$. Therefore $e_1 = 2d+1$, $\deg(T' \cap W_1) = 2d$ and $W_1 \subset T'$. Since $e_1 \leq 3d-2$, we have $L \cap \langle T' \rangle = \emptyset$. We have $h^0(\mathcal{I}_{L \cup T'}(2)) \geq 7$. Let Q be any quadric hypersurface such that $\deg(W_0 \cap Q) > \deg(W_0 \cap (L \cup T'))$. Since $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)) \leq 4d+1-(3d+2)$, we have $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)}(d-2)) = 0$ and hence $A \subset Q$ ([4, Lemma 5.1]). Since $L \cap \langle T' \rangle = \emptyset$, then $L \cup T'$ is the scheme-theoretic base-locus of $|\mathcal{I}_{L \cup T'}(2)|$. Since A is connected, we get $A \subset L$, a contradiction.

(c) Proposition 1 covers the case $b_1 = 2$ and $b_2 = b_3 = b_4 = 1$. Proposition 2 covers the case $b_1 = b_2 = 2$ and $b_3 = 1$. Proposition 4 covers the case $b_1 = 3$ and $b_2 = b_3 = 1$. Proposition 3 covers the case $b_1 = 3$ and $b_2 = 2$.

(d) Now assume $s = 2$, $b_1 = 4$, $b_2 = 1$. Assume $\sharp(B) \leq 3d-2$ and hence $\deg(W_0) \leq 3d+3$. Write $A = A_1 \sqcup \{O_2\}$ and set $\{O_1\} := (A_1)_{red}$. We repeat the proof of Proposition 3, except that now $\{O_2\}$ is the unique reduced connected component of A and hence we cannot freely use [4, Lemma 5.1]; however, $\deg(W_0) < 3d+4$. We write (++xxxx) for the set-up of step (xxx) of the proof of Proposition 3 and use the notation of that step.

(++b1.1.1) Assume $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)}(d-1)) = 0$. We get $O_2 \in B$ and $A_1 \cup B_1 \subset M$, where $B_1 := B \setminus \{O_2\}$. Since $P \neq \nu_d(O_2)$, we get that $\langle \nu_d(A_1) \rangle \cap \langle \nu_d(B_1) \rangle \neq \emptyset$, that $\nu_d(O_2) \notin \langle \nu_d(A_1) \rangle \cap \langle \nu_d(B_1) \rangle$ and that $\langle \nu_d(A) \rangle \cap \langle \nu_d(B) \rangle$ is the linear span of $\nu_d(O_2)$ and $\langle \nu_d(A_1) \rangle \cap \langle \nu_d(B_1) \rangle$. Hence there is a unique $P_1 \in \langle \nu_d(A_1) \rangle \cap \langle \nu_d(B_1) \rangle$ such that $P \in \langle \{P_1, O_2\}$. Since $P \notin \langle W \rangle$ for any $W \subseteq A$ and any $P \subsetneq W$, we get $P_1 \notin \langle A' \rangle$ for any $A' \subsetneq A'$ and any $A' \subsetneq B$. Since A_1 evinces the scheme-rank of P_1, [4, Proposition 5.19] gives $r_{m,d}(P_1) = 3d-2$.

(++b1.2) If $A \cup B \subset Q$, then that proof works. Assume $A \cup B \nsubseteq Q$. We get $O_2 \in B$ and $A_1 \cup B_1 \subset Q$, where $B_1 := B \setminus \{O_2\}$. Varying Q we get $A_1 \cup B_1 \subset F \cup L$. Since $F \cap L = \emptyset$ and $\langle F \rangle$ is a plane, we have $A_1 \nsubseteq F \cup L$, a contradiction.

(++b2) Assume $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{Z_1}(d-1)) = 0$. We repeat step (++b1.1.1) with the hyperplane N_1 instead of the hyperplane M.

(++c) Assume $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{W_1}(d-1)) = 0$. We repeat step (++b1.1.1) with the hyperplane H_1 instead of the hyperplane M.

(++c1) Assume $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)}(d-1)) > 0$. We repeat step (++b1.1.1).

Proposition 1 *Fix integers d, s, m such that $0 \leq s \leq m-1$, and $d \geq m$. Fix a degree 2 connected zero-dimensional scheme $A_1 \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ and a set $S \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ such that $S \cap A_1 = \emptyset$, $\sharp(S) = s$ and the scheme $A := A_1 \cup S$ is linearly independent. Set $\{O\} := (A_1)_{red}$. Fix any $P \in \langle \nu_d(A) \rangle$ such that $P \notin \langle \nu_d(A') \rangle$ for any $A' \subsetneq A$. Then $r_{m,d}(P) = s+d$ and every $B \in \mathcal{S}(P)$ is the disjoint union of S and d points of $\langle A_1 \rangle \setminus \{O\}$.*

Proof By concision ([24, Exercise 3.2.2.2]) it is sufficient to do the case $\langle A\rangle = \mathbb{P}^m$, i.e. the case $m = s+1$. Since the case $m = 1$ is true by Sylvester's theorem ([11]), we may assume $m \geq 2$ and use induction on m. Since $h^1(\mathcal{I}_A(d)) = 0$ and A has only finitely many proper subschemes, P exists and there is a unique point $Q \in \langle \nu_d(A_1)\rangle \setminus \{O\}$ such that $P \in \langle \{Q\} \cup \nu_d(S)\rangle$. Since $r_{1,d}(Q) = d$ by a theorem of Sylvester, we get $r_{m,d}(P) \leq s+d$. Fix $B \in \mathcal{S}(P)$. Set $W_0 := A \cup B$. We have $\deg(W_0) \leq d + 2s + 2 = d + 2m$. Since A is not reduced, we have $A \neq B$ and hence $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{W_0}(d)) > 0$. Take H_i, e_i, W_i, g as in the proof of Theorem 1. Since A spans $\mathbb{P}^m$, if $e_i \leq m-1$, then $e_{i+1} = 0$ and $W_i = \emptyset$. Hence $g \leq d$. If $2 \leq g < d$ we also get $e_i \geq d+m+2-g$ for $i < g$ and hence $d + 2m \geq g(d+m+2-g) - m + 1$ and hence $g \leq 2$. If $g = d$, then $e_d \geq 3$, $e_i \geq m$ if $i < d$ and hence $\deg(W_0) \geq m(d-1) + 3$, a contradiction.

(a) Assume $g = 2$. Set $k := \dim(\langle W_1\rangle)$. Remark 4 for the integer $d-1$ gives $e_2 \geq k + d$. Since A spans $\mathbb{P}^4$ we have $e_1 \geq e_2 + m - k \geq m + d$. Hence $2d + m + k \leq d + 2m$, contradicting the inequality $d \geq m$.

(b) Assume $g = 1$. Since A spans $\mathbb{P}^m$, Remark 4 gives $e_1 \geq d + m + 1$.

(b1) Assume $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{W_1}(d-1)) = 0$. We get $A_1 \subset H_1$ and $S \setminus S \cap H_1 = B \setminus B \cap H_1$ ([4, Lemma 5.1]). Since A is in linearly general position and spans $\mathbb{P}^m$, we get that $S \setminus S \cap H_1$ is a point; call it Q. Since $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{W_1}(d-1)) = 0$, Grassmann's formula gives that $\langle \nu_d(A)\rangle \cap \langle \nu_d(B)\rangle$ is the linear span of $\nu_d(Q)$ and $\langle \nu_d(A \setminus \{Q\})\rangle \cap \langle \nu_d(B \setminus \{Q\})\rangle$. Fix $P_1 \in \langle \nu_d(A \setminus \{Q\})\rangle \cap \langle \nu_d(B \setminus \{Q\})\rangle$ such that $P \in \langle \{\nu_d(Q), P_1\}\rangle$. Since $P \notin \langle A'\rangle$ for any $A' \subsetneq A$, we get $P_1 \notin \langle \nu_d(A \setminus \{Q\})\rangle$. In the same way we get $P_1 \notin \langle \nu_d(B')\rangle$ for any $B' \subsetneq B \setminus \{Q\}$. We may use the inductive assumption in m and get that B is as claimed in the statement of Proposition 1.

(b2) Assume $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{W_1}(d-1)) > 0$ and set $k := \dim(\langle W_1\rangle)$. Remark 4 gives $\deg(W_1) \geq d + k$ and $e_1 \geq d + m$. and hence $d + k \leq m$, a contradiction.

Proposition 2 *Assume $d \geq 7$. Fix $O_3 \in \mathbb{P}^m$, $m \geq 4$ and let A_1, A_2 be connected degree 2 subschemes of $\mathbb{P}^m$ such that $A := A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \{O_3\}$ spans a 4-dimensional linear subspace. Set $\{O_i\} := (A_i)_{red}$. Fix $P \in \langle \nu_d(A)\rangle$ such that $P \notin \langle \nu_d(A')\rangle$ for any $A' \subsetneq A$. Then $r_{m,d}(P) = 2d+1$. There are uniquely determined $P_i \in \langle \nu_d(A_i)\rangle$, $i = 1, 2$, such that A_i evinces the cactus rank of P_i and every $B \in \mathcal{S}(P)$ has a decomposition $B = B_1 \sqcup B_2 \sqcup \{O_3\}$ with $B_i \subset \langle A_i\rangle \setminus \{O_i\}$ $\sharp(B_i) = d$ and $B_i \in \mathcal{S}(P_i)$.*

Proof By concision ([4, Exercise 3.2.2.2]) we may assume $m = 4$. Since $\nu_d(A)\rangle$ is linearly independent, there are unique $P_i \in \langle \nu_d(A_i)\rangle$, $i = 1, 2$, such that $P \in \langle \{P_1, P_2, \nu_d(O_3)\}\rangle$. Since $P \notin \langle \nu_d(A')\rangle$ for any $A' \subsetneq A$, we have $P_i \neq \nu_d(A_i)$. Hence P_i has border rank 2 with respect to the degree d rational normal curve $\nu_d(\langle A_i\rangle$. Since $P \in \langle \nu_d(B_1 \cup B_2 \cup \{O_3\})\rangle$ for all $B_i \in \mathcal{S}(P_i)$, we get $r_{m,d}(P) \leq 2d+1$. Fix any $B \in \mathcal{S}(P)$ and set $W_0 := A \cup B$. We have $\deg(W_0) \leq 2d + 6$. Define H_i, e_i, W_i, g as in the proof of Theorem 1. Since $\deg(W_0) \leq 2d + 6$, we get $g \leq 2$.

(a) Assume $g = 2$. Since $e_1 \geq e_2$ and $e_1 + e_2 \leq 2d + 6$, there is a line $L \subset H_2$ such that $\deg(L \cap W_1) \geq d + 1$. Hence $e_1 \leq d + 5$. Let $N_1 \subset \mathbb{P}^4$

be a hyperplane containing L and with maximal $f_1 := \deg(N_1 \cap W_0)$. Define N_i, f_i, Z_i, g' as in step (b1) of the proof of Theorem 1. We get $g' \le 2$.

(a1) Assume $g' = 2$. Since A spans $\mathbb{P}^4$ we have $f_1 \ge \deg(L \cap W_1) + 2 \ge d + 3$ and hence $f_2 \le d + 3$. Therefore there is a line $R \subset N_2$ such that $\deg(Z_1 \cap R) \ge d + 1$. Since $\deg(R \cap A) \le 2$ and $Z_1 \cap B \subseteq B \setminus B \cap L$, we get $L \ne R$. Any hyperplane M containing $L \cup R$ shows that $e_1 \ge (d+1)+(d+1)-1$, a contradiction.

(a2) Assume $g' = 1$.

(a2.1) Assume $\deg(L \cap W_0) \ge d + 2$. The case $t = 1$ of Remark 5 gives $\deg(L \cap A) = 2$, $\sharp(B \cap L) = d$ and $L \cap A \cap B = \emptyset$. Since A spans $\mathbb{P}^4$, we get $f_1 \ge d + 4$.

(a2.1.1) Assume $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{Z_1}(d-1)) > 0$. Since $\deg(Z_1) \le 2d + 6 - f_1 \le 2(d-1) + 1$, there is a line $R \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ such that $\deg(Z_1 \cap R) \ge d + 1$ and hence with $R \setminus R \cap L \ne \emptyset$ Hence $R \ne L$. Any hyperplane M containing $L \cup R$ has $\deg(M \cap W_0) \ge d + 2 + d + 1 - 1$, contradicting the inequality $e_1 \le d + 5$.

(a2.1.2) Assume $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{Z_1}(d-1)) = 0$. Since $A \nsubseteq N_1$, [4, Lemma 5.1] gives $O_3 \in B$ and $A_1 \cup A_2 \cup (B \setminus \{O_3\} \subset N_1$. Since $e_1 \le d + 5$, we get $\sharp(B) \le d + 2$. Since $\deg(W_0) \le d + 7$, we immediately get $g = 1$, a contradiction.

(a2.2) Assume $\deg(L \cap W_0) = d + 1$. Since $e_1 \le d + 5 \le 2d + 1$, there is a line $R \subset N_1$ such that $\deg(N_1 \cap R) \ge d + 2$ ([5, Lemma 34]). Since $R \ne L$, we get $d + 5 \ge e_1 \ge \deg(N \cap (L \cup R) \ge d + 1 + d + 2 - 1$, a contradiction.

(b) Assume $g = 1$.

(b1) Assume $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{W_1}(d-1)) > 0$. We get $\deg(W_1) \ge d + 1$ ([5, Lemma 34]) and hence $e_1 \le d+5$. Since $h^1(H_1, \mathcal{I}_{H_1 \cap W_0}(d)) > 0$ and $e_1 \le 2d+1$, there is a line $L \subset H_1$ such that $\deg(L \cap W_0) \ge d + 2$. In particular $e_1 \ge d + 2$ and hence $\deg(W_1) \le d + 4$. Since $2(d-1) + 1 \le d + 4$, we get the existence of a line $R \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ such that $\deg(W_1 \cap R) \ge d + 1$. Since $\deg(A \cap R) \le 2$, we obtain $R \cap (B \setminus B \cap L) \ne \emptyset$ and hence $R \ne L$. Any hyperplane containing $L \cup R$ gives $e_1 \ge (d + 2) + (d + 1) - 1 > d + 5$, a contradiction.

(b2) Assume $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{W_1}(d-1)) = 0$. Since $A \nsubseteq H_1$, we get $O_3 \in B$ and $A_1 \cup A_2 \cup (B \setminus \{O_3\}) \subset N_1$ ([4, Lemma 5.1]). Since $\nu_d(A)$ is linearly independent, there is a unique $Q \in \langle \nu_d(A_1 \cup A_2) \rangle$ such that $P \in \langle \{Q \cup \nu_d(O_3)\} \rangle$ (we have $\{Q\} = \langle \nu_d(A_1 \cup A_2) \rangle \cap \langle \{P, \nu_d(O_3)\} \rangle$). We get that $A_1 \cup A_2$ evinces the cactus rank and the border rank of Q and that $Q \in \langle \nu_d(B \setminus \{O_3\}) \rangle$. Since $B \in \mathcal{S}(P)$, we get $B \setminus \{O\} \in \mathcal{S}(Q)$. Now we repeat the construction in H_1 with $A' := A_1 \cup A_2$ and $B' := B \setminus \{O_3\}$. From now on we work inside the 3-dimensional projective space H_1 and we use planes contained in H_1 as hyperplane. We use the notations $W_i, H_i, e_i, g, Z_i, f_i, g_i$ in this new set-up. For instance $W_0 = (A_1 \cup A_2) \cup (B \setminus \{O\})$ and with respect to the point Q instead of the point P. We need to check that $B \setminus \{O_3\} \in \mathcal{S}(Q)$ and describe $B \setminus \{O_3\}$. For the first part it is sufficient to apply [4, Proposition 5.17] (which gives $r_{m,d}(Q) \le 2d$), because we have $\sharp(B \setminus \{O_3\}) \le 2d$. In particular we checked that $r_{m,d}(P) = 2d+1$, i.e. the part of Proposition 2 used in Theorem 1. The only difference with respect to the proof of Theorem 1 is that (since we are working with planes) we only now that if $e_i \le 2$, then $e_{i+1} = 0$ and $W_i = \emptyset$ and that if $f_i \le 2$, then $f_{i+1} = 0$ and $Z_i = 0$. We have $w_0 := \deg(A_1 \cup A_2 \cup (B \setminus \{O_3\})) \le 2d + 4$. First assume

$g \geq d+2$ (resp. $g' \geq d+1$). We get $w_0 \geq 1+3(d+1)$, a contradiction. Now assume $g = d+1$ (resp. $g' = d+1$). We find $w_0 > 3d$, a contradiction. Now assume $g < d$ and $e_g \geq 2(d+1-g)+2$ (resp. $g' < d$ and $f_{g'} \geq 2(d+1-g)+2$). We get $w_0 \geq 2g(d+1-g)+4$ (resp. $w_0 \geq 2g'(d+1-g')+4$) and hence $g = 1$ (resp. $g' = 1$). In particular if H_1 is a plane of $\mathbb{P}^3$ with $\deg(H_1 \cap W_0)$ maximal, then $h^1(H_1, \mathcal{I}_{H_1 \cap W_0}(d)) > 0$ and hence (since $H_1 \cap W_0$ spans H_1) $e_1 \geq d+3$ (Remark 4). Since $A_1 \cup A_2$ spans $\mathbb{P}^3$ and no connected component of $A_1 \cup A_2$ is reduced, [4, Lemma 5.1] gives $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{W_1}(d-1)) > 0$ and in particular $\deg(W_1) \geq d+1$. Hence $e_1 \leq d+3$, which implies $\deg(W_1) = d+1$ and the existence of a line R such that $W_1 \subset R$. Since $e_1 \leq d+3$, there is a line $L \subset H_1$ such that $\deg(L \cap W_0) \geq d+2$. Remark 5 gives that either $L = \langle A_1 \rangle$ or that $L = \langle A_2 \rangle$, $\sharp(B \cap L) = d$ and $B \cap (A_1 \cup A_2) \cap L) = \emptyset$. Up to renaming A_1 and A_2 we may assume $L = \langle A_1 \rangle$. Remark 5 gives $O_1 \notin B$ and $\sharp(B \cap L) = d$, i.e. $B \cap \langle A_1 \rangle$ is as described in the statement of Proposition 2. Remark 5 gives $O_2 \in R$ and that either $O_2 \notin H_1$, $R = \langle A_2 \rangle$ and $\sharp(B \cap W_1) = d-1$ or $O_2 \in H_1 \cap R$, $R = \langle A_2 \rangle$ and $\sharp(B \cap (R \setminus \{O_2, O_3\})) = d+1$. In the latter case we get $O_2 \notin B$, because we know that $\sharp(B) \leq 2d+1$. Hence in the latter case $B \setminus \{O_3\} \subset \langle A_1 \rangle \cup \langle A_2 \rangle$ and each $B \cap \langle A_i \rangle$ is as described in Proposition 2. Now assume $O_2 \notin H_1$. Recall that $R = \langle A_2 \rangle$ and $L = \langle A_1 \rangle$. Since $e_1 = d+3$, there is a unique $o \in (B \setminus \{O_3\}) \cap H_1$ such that $H_1 = \langle L \cup \{o\} \rangle$. Fix any $Q \in (B \setminus B \cap H_1)$ and set $M := \langle \{Q\} \cup L \rangle$. Since $e_1 = d+3$, we have $o \notin M$. Since $A_1 \cup A_2$ has no reduced connected component, [4, Lemma 5.1] gives $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)}(d-1)) > 0$. We first get the existence of a line $R' \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ such that $\deg(R' \cap \mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) \geq d+1$ and then $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) = d+1$, $\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0) \subset R'$ and $R' = R$. We get $o \in \langle A_2 \rangle$. Hence $B \cap \langle A_2 \rangle$ is as described in the statement of Proposition 2 and $B \setminus \{O_3\} \subset \langle A_2 \rangle \cup \langle A_1 \rangle$.

For a description of $\mathcal{S}(P_1)$ and $\mathcal{S}(P_2)$ below see [2, part (b3) of Theorem 4 and part (f) of §4] and[2, Proposition 1 and Theorem 3], respectively. The case in which the conic $C \supset A_1 \cup B_1$ is reducible is described in [2, Proposition 7].

Proposition 3 *Fix an integer $d \geq 9$. Let $A_1 \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be a degree 3 connected curvilinear scheme spanning a plane and $A_2 \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be a degree two connected curvilinear scheme. Assume $\langle A_1 \rangle \cap \langle A_2 \rangle = \emptyset$, i.e. assume $A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$ and $\dim(\langle A_1 \cup A_2 \rangle) = 4$. Then $r_{m,d}(P) = 3d-1$. Fix any $B \in \mathcal{S}(P)$. Then there is a unique decomposition $B = B_1 \sqcup B_2$ with $B \cap A_{red} = \emptyset$, $\sharp(B_1) = 2d-1$, $\sharp(B_2) = d$, $B_1 \subset \langle A_1 \rangle$, $B_2 \subset \langle A_2 \rangle$, each B_i evincing the symmetric tensor rank of a uniquely determined point of $P_i \in \langle \nu_d(A_i) \rangle$. The scheme $A_1 \cup B_1$ is contained in a reduced conic $C \subset \langle A_1 \rangle$.*

Conversely, for any $P_i \in \langle \nu_d(A_i) \rangle$, $i = 1, 2$, such that $P_i \notin \langle \nu_d(A') \rangle$ for any $A' \subsetneq A_i$, any $B_i \in \mathcal{S}(P_i)$ and any $P \in \langle \{P_1, P_2\} \rangle \setminus \{P_1, P_2\}$ we have $B_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset$ and $B_1 \cup B_2 \in \mathcal{S}(P)$.

Proof Since $P \in \langle \nu_d(A) \rangle$ and $\langle \nu_d(A_1) \rangle \cap \langle \nu_d(A_2) \rangle = \emptyset$, there are uniquely determined $P_i \in \langle \nu_d(A_i) \rangle$, $i = 1, 2$, such that $P \in \langle \{P_1, P_2\} \rangle$. Since $P \notin \langle \nu_d(A') \rangle$ for any $A' \subsetneq A$, then $P \neq P_i$ and $P_i \notin \langle \nu_d(A') \rangle$ for any $A' \subsetneq A$. Every element of $\mathcal{S}(P_i)$ is contained in $\langle A_i \rangle$ ([24, Exercise 3.2.2.2]) and each

element of $\mathcal{S}(P_i)$ is known ([2, Proposition 1 and Theorem 2] for $i = 1$, [2, Theorem 3 and §4] for $i = 2$). Since $\langle A_1\rangle \cap \langle A_2\rangle = \emptyset$, we have $B_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset$ for all $B_i \in \mathcal{S}(P_i)$.

Set $\{O_1\} = (A_1)_{red}$ and $\{O_2\} = (A_2)_{red}$. Fix $B \in \mathcal{S}(P)$. Since $r_{m,d}(P_1) = 2d-1$ and $r_{m,d}(P_2) = d$, we have $r_{m,d}(P) \le 3d-1$. Hence to prove all the assertions of the proposition it is sufficient to prove that $B = B_1 \sqcup B_2$ with $B_i \in \mathcal{S}(P_i)$ for all i. Set $W_0 := A \cup B$. We have $w_0 := \deg(W_0) \le 3d+4$. Define e_i, H_i, W_i, g as in step (b) of the Theorem 1. Since $w_0 \le 3d+4$, we get $g \le 3$.

(a) Assume $g = 3$. Since $e_1 \ge e_2 \ge e_3$ and $e_1 + e_2 + e_3 \le 3d+4$, we have $e_3 \le d+1 \le 2(d-2)+1$. Since $h^1(H_3, \mathcal{I}_{W_2\cap H_3}(d-2)) > 0$, there is a line $L \subset H_3$ such that $\deg(L \cap W_2) \ge d$. Since A spans $\mathbb{P}^4$, the maximality property of the integer e_2 gives $e_2 \ge 2 + \deg(L \cap W_1) \ge d+2$. Since $e_1 \ge e_2$, we get $e_1 = e_2 = d+2$ and $e_3 = d$. Set $Z_0 := W_0$ and define Z_i, N_i, f_i, g' as in step (b1) of the proof of Theorem 1. As above we get $g' \le 3$ and $f_1 = d+2$.

(a1) Assume $g' = 3$. As above we get $f_1 = f_2 = d+2$, $f_3 = d$ and the existence of a line $R \subset N_3$ such that $Z_3 \subset R$. Since $\deg(R \cap A) \le 2$, we have $R \cap (B \setminus B \cap N_1) \neq \emptyset$ and hence $R \neq L$. Hence $\deg(W_0 \cap (L \cup R)) \ge d+d-1 > d+2 = e_1$, contradicting the existence of a hyperplane containing $L \cup R$.

(a2) Assume $g' = 2$. Since $f_2 \le 3d+4-f_1$, Lemma 1 gives that either there is a line $D \subset N_2$ with $\deg(D \cap Z_1) \ge d+1$ or there is a conic $F \subset N_2$ with $\deg(F \cap W_1) \ge 2d$. The latter case is impossible, because $e_1 < 2d$. Hence D exists. Since $\deg(D \cap A) \le 2$, we have $D \cap (B \setminus B \cap N_1) \neq \emptyset$ and hence $D \neq L$. Any hyperplane $M \supset D \cup L$ gives $e_1 \ge (d+1) + d - 1 > d+2$, a contradiction.

(a3) Assume $g' = 1$. Since $f_1 \le e_1 = d+2$, [5, Lemma 34] gives the existence of a line $T \subset N_1$ such that $\deg(Z_0 \cap T) \ge d+2$. Since A spans $\mathbb{P}^4$, we get $e_1 \ge 2 + \deg(Z_0 \cap T)$, a contradiction.

(b) Assume $g = 2$. Since $e_1 \ge e_2$ and $e_1 + e_2 \le 3d+4$, we have $e_2 \le 2(d-1)+1$. Hence [5, Lemma 34] gives the existence of a line $L \subset N_2$ such that $\deg(L \cap W_1) \ge d+1$. We define Z_i, f_i, N_i, g' with respect to the line L met in this step. We have $f_1 \ge \deg(L \cap W_1) + 2 \ge d+3$. Hence $\sum_{i\ge 2} f_i \le 2d+1$, excluding the case $g' = 3$. Therefore $1 \le g' \le 2$.

(b1) Assume $g' = 2$. Since $f_2 \le 2d+1$, either there is a line $R \subset N_2$ with $\deg(R \cap Z_1) \ge d+1$ or there is a reduced conic $F \subset N_2$ with $\deg(F \cap W_1) \ge 2d$ (Lemma 1 and Remark 3).

(b1.1) Assume the existence of the line $R \subset N_2$ with $\deg(R \cap Z_1) \ge d+1$. Since $L \subset N_1$ and $R \cap (B \setminus B \cap N_1) \neq \emptyset$, we have $R \neq L$. Let M be a hyperplane containing $R \cup L$ and such $h_1 := \deg(M \cap W_0)$ is maximal. If $R \cap L = \emptyset$, then $h_1 \ge 2d+2$. If $R \cap L \neq \emptyset$, then $h_1 \ge 1 + \deg(W_0 \cap (L \cup R)) \ge 2d+2$.

(b1.1.1) Assume $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_{M}(W_0)}(d-1)) = 0$. Since no connected component of A is reduced, [4, Lemma 5.1] gives $A \cup B \subset M$, a contradiction.

(b1.1.2) Assume $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_{M}(W_0)}(d-1)) > 0$. Since $h_1 \ge 2d+2$, we have $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) \le d+2 \le 2(d-1)+1$. Hence there is a line $D \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ such that $\deg(D \cap \mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) \ge d+1$. Since $R \cup L \subset M$, the lines D, L, R are

different. We have $h^0(\mathcal{I}_{D\cup L\cup R}(2)) \geq 6$. Fix a general $Q \in |\mathcal{I}_{D\cup L\cup R}(2)|$. We have $\deg(Q \cap W_0) \geq \deg(W_0 \cap R) + \deg(W_0 \cap L) - 1 + \deg(W_0 \cap D) - 2$ and hence $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)}(d-2)) = 0$. Since no connected component of A is reduced, [4, Lemma 5.1] applied to the degree two hypersurface Q instead of a hyperplane gives $W_0 \subset Q$. Hence W_0 is contained in the scheme-theoretic base locus $\mathcal{B}$ of $|\mathcal{I}_{D\cup L\cup R}(2)|$. The scheme $\mathcal{B}$ depends from the mutual position of the 3 lines, D, L, R, but just knowing that $A \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ gives that $\mathcal{B}$ spans $\mathbb{P}^4$. Hence either the 3 lines L, D, R are disjoint and $\langle L \cup D \cup R\rangle = \mathbb{P}^4$ or two of these lines, say J_1, J_2 meets, while the other one, J_3, is disjoint from the plane $\langle J_1 \cup J_2\rangle$. The former case cannot occur, because A_1 is contained in no line. Assume that $J_1 \cup J_2$ is a conic and that $J_3 \cap \langle J_1 \cup J_2\rangle = \emptyset$. We have $\mathcal{B} = J_1 \cup J_2 \cup J_3$. Since A_1 is not contained in a line, we get $A_1 \subset J_1 \cup J_2$ (and hence $A_2 \subset J_3$) and $\{O_1\} = J_1 \cap J_2$. Set $B_1 := B \cap (J_1 \cup J_2)$ and $B_2 := B \cap J_3$. Since $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\langle J_1\cup J_2\rangle\cup J_3}(d)) = 0$ and $J_3 \cap \langle J_1 \cup J_2\langle = \emptyset$, the projective space $\langle \nu_d(J_1\cup J_2\cup J_3)\rangle$ is spanned by its two subspaces $\langle \nu_d(J_1\cup L_2)\rangle$ and $\langle \nu_d(J_3)\rangle$. Hence there are uniquely determined points $U_1 \in \langle \nu_d(J_1 \cup J_2)\rangle$ and $U_2 \in \langle \nu_d(J_3)\rangle$ such that $P \in \langle\{U_1, U_2\}\rangle$. For the same reason there are uniquely determined points $Q_1 \in \langle \nu_d(A_1)\rangle$, $Q_2 \in \langle \nu_d(A_2)\rangle$, $Q'_1 \in \langle \nu_d(B_1)\rangle$, $Q'_2 \in \langle \nu_d(B_2)\rangle$ such that $P \in \langle\{Q_1, Q_2\}\rangle$ and $P \in \langle\{Q'_1, Q'_2\}\rangle$. The uniqueness of U_i, $i = 1, 2$, gives $U_i = Q_i$ and $U_i = Q'_i$. Hence $Q_i = Q'_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Obviously A_i evinces the scheme-rank and the border-rank of Q_i. Since B evinces the rank of P, B_i evinces the rank of Q_i. Since $(J_1 \cup J_2) \cap J_3 = \emptyset$, we also get $B_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset$. Hence B is as claimed in the statement of Proposition 3.

(b1.2) Assume the existence of the conic F with $\deg(F \cap W_1) \geq 2d$, but that there is no line R as in (b1.1). Since $L \subset N_1$, $W_1 \cap B \cap N_1 = \emptyset$ and $\deg(L \cap A) \leq 2$, we get $\deg(W_0 \cap (L \cup F)) \geq 3d - 2$. Since $e_2 \geq d + 1$, we have $e_1 \leq 3d + 4 - e_2 < 3d - 2$. Hence $\langle L \cup F\rangle = \mathbb{P}^4$, i.e. $L \cap \langle F\rangle = \emptyset$. Therefore $L \cup F$ is the scheme-theoretic intersection of the linear system $|\mathcal{I}_{F\cup L}(2)|$. Fix a general $Q \in |\mathcal{I}_{F\cup L}(2)|$. Since $F \cap L = \emptyset$, we have $\deg(Q \cap W_0) \geq 3d + 1$ and hence $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)) \leq 3 \leq d - 1$. Therefore $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_Q(F\cup L}(d-2)) = 0$. Since no connected component of A is reduced, [4, Lemma 5.1] gives $A \cup B \subset Q$. Since $L \cup F$ is the scheme-theoretic intersection of the linear system $|\mathcal{I}_{F\cup L}(2)|$, we get $A \cup B \subset L \cup F$. Since $L \cap \langle F\rangle = \emptyset$ and $A_1 \nsubseteq F$, we get $A_2 \subset L$ and $A_1 \subset F$. We repeat the last part of the proof of step (b1.1.1) with F instead of $J_1 \cup J_2$ and L instead of J_3.

(b2) Assume $g' = 1$. If $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{Z_1}(d-1)) = 0$, then [4, Lemma 5.1] gives $A \subset N_1$ (because no connected component of A is reduced), a contradiction. Hence we may assume $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{Z_1}(d-1)) > 0$. Since $f_1 \geq d+3$, we have $\deg(Z_1) \leq 2d + 1$ and hence either there is a line $R \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ such that $\deg(R \cap Z_1) \geq d + 1$ or there is a reduced conic $F \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ such that $\deg(F \cap Z_1) \geq 2d$. In the second case we repeat the proof of step (b1.2.1). In the first case we repeat all steps of (b1.2).

(c) Assume $g = 1$. Since $A \nsubseteq H_1$ and no connected component of A is reduced, [4, Lemma 5.1] gives $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{W_1}(d-1)) > 0$. Remark 4 gives $e_1 \geq d + 4$ and hence $\deg(W_1) \leq 2d$. Hence either there is a line $R \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ with

$\deg(R \cap W_1) \geq d+1$ or $\deg(W_1) = 2d$, $e_1 = d+4$ and there is a reduced conic $F \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ such that $W_1 \subset F$. The second case is impossible, because it would give $e_1 \geq 2d+1$. Therefore there is a line $R \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ with $\deg(R \cap W_1) \geq d+1$. We also have $e_1 \leq 2d+3$. Since $h^1(H_1, \mathcal{I}_{N_1 \cap W_0}(d)) > 0$ and $e_1 \leq 2d+3$, either there is a line $L \subset H_1$ with $\deg(L \cap W_0) \geq d+2$ or there is a conic $F \subset H_1$ such that $\deg(F \cap W_0) \geq 2d+2$ (Lemma 1).

(c1) Assume the existence of a line $L \subset H_1$ with $\deg(L \cap W_0) \geq d+2$. Since $\deg(R \cap A) \leq 2$, we have $R \cap (B \setminus B \cap H_1)) \neq \emptyset$ and hence $R \neq L$. Let $M \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be a hyperplane containing $\langle L \cup R \rangle$ and with maximal $\deg(M \cap W_0)$. If $L \cap R \neq \emptyset$, then $\deg(W_0 \cap (L \cup R)) \geq 2d+2$ and hence $\deg(M \cap W_0) \geq 2d+3$. If $L \cap R = \emptyset$, then $\deg(M \cap W_0) \geq 2d+3$. Since $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)}(d-1)) > 0$ by [4, Lemma 5.1], we first get $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) \geq d+1$ and then $e_1 = \deg(W_0 \cap M) = 2d+3$, $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) = d+1$ and the existence of a line $D \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ such that $\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0) \subset D$. See step (b1.1.1); in this case $J_3 = L$, $\{J_1, J_2\} = \{R, D\}$. A posteriori we get $R \cap D = \{O_1\}$ and $A_2 \subset L$; $B \cap (R \cup D)$ is as described in [2, Proposition 7].

(c2) Assume the existence of the conic F, but the non-existence of any line $L \subset H_1$ with $\deg(L \cap W_0) \geq d+2$. Remark 4 gives that F is reduced and that if $F = J_1 \cup J_2$ with each J_i is a line, then $\deg(J_i \cap W_0) = d+1$, $i = 0, 1$. Since $e_1 \leq 2d+3$ and A spans $\mathbb{P}^4$, we get $e_1 = 2d+3$, $\deg(F \cap W_0) = 2d+2$ and $\deg(W_0 \cap \langle F \rangle) = 2d+2$. Since $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{W_1}(d-1)) > 0$ by [4, Lemma 5.1] and $\deg(W_1) \leq d+1$, we get $\deg(W_1) = d+1$ and the existence of a line $J \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ such that $W_1 \subset J$. Since $\deg(J \cap A) \leq 2$, we have $J \cap (B \setminus B \cap H_1) \neq \emptyset$ and hence $J \nsubseteq F$. If $J \cap \langle F \rangle \neq \emptyset$, then $e_1 \geq 2d+2+d+1-2$, a contradiction. Therefore $J \cap \langle F \rangle = \emptyset$. We go as in step (b1.2), i.e. as in the last part of step (b.1.1.1).

Proposition 4 *Fix integers $s \geq 0$, $m \geq s+2$ and $d \geq 2m+1$. Fix a degree 3 curvilinear zero-dimensional scheme $A_1 \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ with $\dim(\langle A_1 \rangle) = 2$ and a set $S \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ such that $S \cap A_1 = \emptyset$, $\sharp(S) = s$, S is linearly independent and $\langle S \rangle \cap \langle A_1 \rangle = \emptyset$. Set $A := A_1 \cup S$. Fix any $P \in \langle \nu_d(A) \rangle$ such that $P \notin \langle \nu_d(A') \rangle$ for any $A' \subsetneq A$. There is a unique $P_1 \in \langle \nu_d(A_1) \rangle$ such that $P \in \langle \{P_1\} \cup \nu_d(S) \rangle$. We have $P_1 \notin \langle \nu_d(A') \rangle$ for any $A' \subsetneq A$. Then $r_{m,d}(P) = s+2d-1$ and every $B \in \mathcal{S}(P)$ is of the form $B = B_1 \sqcup S$ with $B_1 \in \mathcal{S}(P_1)$ (and the converse holds). The elements of $\mathcal{S}(P_1)$ are described in the case $m = 2$ of [2, part (b3) of Theorem 4 and part (f) of §4].*

Proof The last sentence follows from concision ([24, Exercise 3.2.2.2]).

The scheme A is linearly independent and $\deg(A) = 3+s$. Hence $\nu_d(A)$ is linearly independent. Every element of $\mathcal{S}(P)$ is contained in $\langle A \rangle$ ([24, Exercise 3.2.2.2.]). Hence it is sufficient to do the case $s = m-2$. Fix any $B \in \mathcal{S}(P)$. Since $P \in \langle \nu_d(E \cup S) \rangle$ for any $E \in \mathcal{S}(P_1)$, we have $r_{m,d}(P) \leq m+2d-3$ and it is sufficient to prove that $B = S \sqcup B_1$ with $B_1 \in \mathcal{S}(P_1)$. Set $\{O\} := (A_1)_{red}$ and let $\mathbf{w}$ the degree two subscheme of A_1. If $m = 2$, then this proposition is the case $m = 2$ of [2, part (b3) of Theorem 4]. Hence we may assume $m > 2$ and use induction on m. Set $W_0 := A \cup B$ and define H_i, e_i and g as in step (b) of the proof of Theorem 1. If $e_i \leq m-1$, then $e_{i+1} = 0$ and $W_i = \emptyset$. We

have $w_0 := \deg(W_0) \le 2d+2m-2$. Assume for the moment $g = d+1$. We get $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{W_d \cap H_{d+1}}) > 0$, i.e. $e_{d+1} \ge 2$. Since $e_{d+1} > 0$, we have $e_i \ge m$ for $i \le d$ and hence $2d+2m-2 \le md+2$, which is absurd if $m > 2$; for $m = 2$ we have $s = 0$, $P_1 = P$ and the statement is a tautology. Assume $g \ge d+2$. We get $W_{d+1} \ne \emptyset$ and hence $2d+2m-2 \ge 1+m(d+1)$, a contradiction. Now assume $2 \le g \le d$. Using Remark 4 we get $2d+2m-2 \ge g(d+1+m-g)-m+2$. Since $d \ge 2m+1$, we get $g \le 2$. Hence $1 \le g \le 2$.

(a) Assume $g = 2$. Since $e_1 \ge e_2$ and $4d > 2d+m-2$, we have $e_1 \le 2d-1$. By [5, Lemma 34] there is a line $L \subset H_2$ such that $\deg(L \cap W_1) \ge d+1$. Since $e_2 \ge d+1$, we have $e_1 \le d+2m-3$. Set $Z_0 := W_0$. Set $k := \dim(\langle H_2 \cap W_1 \rangle)$. If $k \le m-2$, then the maximality property of the integer e_2 gives $W_2 = \emptyset$. Remark 1 for the integer $d-1$ gives $e_2 \ge d+k$. Since $e_1 \ge e_2$, if $k = m-1$ we have $e_1+e_2 = 2d+2m-2$. Hence in all cases we have $W_2 = \emptyset$. Let $M \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ be a hyperplane containing $\langle H_2 \cap W_1 \rangle$ and with maximal $\deg(W_0 \cap M)$ (we have $M = H_2$ if $k = m-1$). Since A spans $\mathbb{P}^m$, we have $\deg(W_0 \cap M) \ge d+m-1$ and hence $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) \le d+m-1$.

(a1) Assume $h^1(M, \mathcal{I}_{M \cap W_0}(d)) = 0$. Set $Z_0 := W_0$. A residual exact sequence gives $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)}(d-1)) > 0$. Since $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) \le d+m-1 \le 2d-1$, there is a line $L \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ such that $\deg(L \cap \mathrm{Res}_M(W_0)) \ge d+1$. Let $N_1 \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ be a hyperplane such that $N_1 \subset L$ and $f_1 := \deg(N_1 \cap W_0)$ is maximal and set $Z_1 := \mathrm{Res}_{N_1}(Z_0)$. Since A spans $\mathbb{P}^m$, then $f_1 \le d+m-1$ and hence $\deg(Z_1) \le d+m-2$. For all integers $i \ge 2$ define f_i, Z_i, N_i as in step (b1) of the proof of Theorem 1. We have $f_i \ge f_{i+1}$ for all $i \ge 2$ and $f_{i+1} = 0$ if $f_i \le m-1$. By residual exact sequence like (2) we get the existence of a minimal integer $g' > 0$ such that $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{W_{g'-1} \cap N_{g'}}(d+1-g')) > 0$. As in step (b1) of the proof of Theorem 1 we get $g' \le 2$.

(a1.1) Assume $g' = 2$. Since $d+m-2 \le 2(d-2)+1$, there is a line $R \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ such that $\deg(R \cap Z_1) \ge d+1$. Since $\deg(R \cap A) \le 2$, we have $\deg(R \cap Z_1 \cap B) > 0$. Since $Z_1 \cap B = B \setminus B \cap N_1$ and $L \subset N_1$, we have $R \ne L$. First assume that either $L \cap R \ne \emptyset$ or $m \ge 4$ (i.e. assume that $L \cup R$ is contained in a hyperplane of $\mathbb{P}^m$). Since $\deg(L \cap R) = 1$ as schemes, we get $e_1 \ge d+1+d+1-1$. Hence $2d+1 \le d+2m-3$, contradicting our assumption $d \ge 2m+1$. Now assume $m = 3$ and $L \cap R = \emptyset$. Since A_1 is connected and spans a plane, we have $A_1 \nsubseteq L \cup R$. Fix a general $Q \in |\mathcal{I}_{L \cup R}(2)|$. Since A_1 is curvilinear and $L \cup R$ is the scheme-theoretic base locus of the linear system $|\mathcal{I}_{L \cup R}(2)|$, we have $A_1 \nsubseteq Q$. Since $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)) \le 2d+2m-2-(d+1)-(d+1) \le d-1$ (by our assumption $d \ge 2m+1$), we have $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)}(d-2)) = 0$. By [4, Lemma 5.1] applied to the degree two surface Q instead of a plane we get $A_1 \subset Q$, a contradiction.

(a1.2) Assume $g' = 1$.

(a1.2.1) Assume $h^1(M, \mathcal{I}_{M \cap W_0}(d)) = 0$. By [4, Lemma 5.1] we have $A_1 \subset M$ and $S \setminus S \cap M = B \setminus B \cap M$. Since A spans $\mathbb{P}^m$, we have $S \ne S \cap M$. Set $E := S \cap B$. We just saw that $E \ne \emptyset$ and that $(W_0 \setminus E) \subset M$. Since $E \subset S$, we have $h^1(\mathcal{I}_E(d-1)) = 0$. Hence a residual exact sequence and Grassmann's formula gives that $\langle \nu_d(A) \rangle \cap \langle \nu_d(B) \rangle$ is spanned by its subspaces

$\langle \nu_d(A \setminus E)\rangle \cap \langle \nu_d(B \setminus E)\rangle$ and $\langle \nu_d(E)\rangle$ and that these subspaces are disjoint. Take any $Q_1 \in \langle \nu_d(A \setminus E)\rangle \cap \langle \nu_d(B \setminus E)\rangle$ such that $P \in \langle \{Q_1\} \cup \nu_d(E)\rangle$. Since $P \notin \langle \nu_d(A')\rangle$ for any $A' \subsetneq A$, we have $Q_1 \notin \langle \nu_d(A')\rangle$ for any $A' \subsetneq A$. Q_1 is the only point of $\langle \nu_d(A \setminus E)\rangle$ such that $P \in \langle \nu_d(E) \cup \{Q_1\}\rangle$ and P_1 is associated also to Q_1. By induction on m (or [2] if $m - \sharp(E) = 2$) we get $r_{m,d}(Q_1) = 2d+m-3-\sharp(E)$ and that every $U \in \mathcal{S}(Q_1)$ is of the form $U \sqcup S \setminus E$ with $\sharp(U) = 2d-1$ and $U \in \mathcal{S}(P_1)$. See Step (b2) below.

(a1.2.1) Assume $h^1(M, \mathcal{I}_{M\cap W_0}(d)) > 0$. Since $\deg(M \cap W_0) \le e_1 \le 2d-1$, there is a line $R \subset M$ such that $\deg(R \cap W_0) \ge d+2$.

(a1.2.1.1) Assume $R = L$. Take N_i, Z_i, f_i as in step (a1). Now it is easier, because $f_1 \ge d+m$.

(a1.2.1.2) Assume $R \neq L$. First assume that either $m \ge 4$ or $m = 3$ and $R \cap L \neq \emptyset$, i.e. assume $\langle R \cup L\rangle \neq \mathbb{P}^m$. Since $\deg(R \cap L) = 1$, we get $e_1 \ge d+2+d+1-1$, a contradiction. Now assume $m = 3$ (and hence $w_0 \le 2d+4$) and $L \cap R = \emptyset$. We have $\deg(W_0 \cap (L \cup R)) \ge 2d+3$ and $A_1 \nsubseteq L \cup R$. Hence one of the lines L, R (call it D and call J the other one) is spanned by the only degree two subscheme of A and $B \cup S \subset L \cup R$. Since A_1 is curvilinear and $L \cup R$ is the scheme-theoretic base locus of $|\mathcal{I}_{L\cup R}(2)|$, there is a quadric surface $Q \supset L \cup R$ such that $A_1 \nsubseteq Q$. Since $\deg(\mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)) = 1$, we have $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_Q(W_0)}(d-2)) = 0$. By [4, Lemma 5.1] applied to the degree two surface Q instead of a plane we get $A_1 \subset Q$, a contradiction.

(b) Assume $g = 1$. Since $W_0 \cap H_1$ spans H_1, we have $e_1 \ge d+m+1$ (Remark 4).

(b1) Assume $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{W_1}(d-1)) > 0$. Therefore $\deg(W_1) \ge d+1$ and hence $e_1 \le d+2m-3$. Since $(d+m+1)+2d > 2d+2m-2$, we have $\deg(W_1) < 2d$. Hence there is a line $L \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ such that $\deg(W_1 \cap L) \ge d+1$. Hence $e_1 \le d+2m-3 \le 2d+1$. Therefore there is a line $R \subset H_1$ such that $\deg(R \cap W_0) \le d+2$. Since $\deg(A \cap L) \le 2$, we have $L \cap (B \setminus B \cap H_1) \neq \emptyset$. Since $R \subset H_1$, we have $R \neq L$. As in step (a1.1) we get a contradiction.

(b2) Assume $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{W_1}(d-1)) = 0$. Copy step (a1.2.1.2) with H_1 instead of M.

Remark 6 Fix integers $b > 0$ and $m \ge b-1$. Let $E \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ be a curvilinear connected scheme of degree b. Set $\{O\} := E_{red}$. The local Hilbert scheme of the regular local ring $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^m,O}$ is smooth and irreducible at E and of dimension $(m-1)(b-1)$ ([19]). Therefore, if we don't prescribe O, but only the integer b we get that the set of all possible E is parametrized by an irreducible variety of dimension $m+(m-1)(b-1)$. Alternatively, we may consider the equisingular deformations of E in $\mathbb{P}^m$ and get (in the curvilinear case) that it is parametrized by a smooth variety of dimension $m+(m-1)(b-1)$. If $d \ge b-1$, then $\dim(\langle \nu_d(E)\rangle) = b-1$. If we take a type $(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)$ with $\sum_i b_i = 5$ and general $E_1, \dots, E_s$ with E_i curvilinear and $\deg(E_i) = b_i$, then in the computation of Remark 8 below we only need to use that $\dim(\langle \nu_d(E_1 \cup \dots \cup E_s)\rangle) = 4$ and get the dimensions claimed in Remark 8 and Proposition 5 below.

Remark 7 Fix a combinatorial type $(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)$ with $s \ge 1$ and $b_1+\dots+b_s = 5$. All A evincing the the border rank of some degree $d \ge 9$ polynomial and

with combinatorial type $(s; b_1, \dots, s)$ is obtained in the following way. Fix a 4-dimensional linear subspace $M \subseteq \mathbb{P}^m$ and s linearly independent points $O_1, \dots, O_s \in M$. For $i = 1, \dots, s$ let $M_i \subseteq M$ be a $(b_i - 1)$-dimensional linear subspace such that $O_i \in M_i$, $\dim(M_i) = b_i$ and $M_1 \cup \dots \cup M_s$ spans M, i.e. the subspaces $M_1, \dots, M_s$ are linearly independent. Let $D_i \subseteq M_i$ be the rational normal curve of M_i with the convention that $D_i = \{O_i\}$ if $b_i = 1$ (i.e. if $M_i = \{O_i\}$) and $D_i = M_i$ if $b_i = 2$ (i.e. if M_i is a line). Let $A_i \subset D_i$ be the effective degree b_i divisor of D_i with O_i as its support with the convention $A_i = \{O_i\}$ if $b_i = 1$. Set $A := A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_s$. Since each A_i spans M_i, A is a curvilinear degree 5 scheme of combinatorial type $(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)$ spanning M. Since $d \geq 4$, we have $\dim\langle \nu_d(A)\rangle = 4$. Take any $P \in \langle \nu_d(A)\rangle$ such that $P \notin \langle \nu_d(A')\rangle$ for any $A' \subsetneq A$. Since $d \geq 5$, P has border rank 5 and cactus rank 5 and A is the only scheme evincing the cactus rank of P ([9, Corollary 2.7]). All possible $M, O_1, \dots, O_s, D_1, \dots, D_s$ are projectively equivalent and so all schemes with combinational type $(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)$ are projectively equivalent.

Remark 8 Since $d \geq 5$, a theorem of Alexander and Hirschowitz gives that $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})$ and $\sigma_5(X_{m,d}) \setminus \sigma_4(X_{m,d})$ have dimension $5m+4$. Now assume $d \geq 9$ so that each point of $\sigma_5(X_{m,d}) \setminus \sigma_4(X_{m,d})$ has a unique type. For any type $(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)$ let $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)$ denote the set of all $P \in \sigma_5(X_{m,d}) \setminus \sigma_4(X_{m,d})$ with type $(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)$. Let $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)'$ denote the subset of the algebraic set $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)$ formed by all P whose cactus rank is evinced by a linearly independent scheme. Let $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)''$ denote the subset of $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)$ formed by all P whose cactus rank is evinced by a curvilinear scheme. In the proof of Theorem 1 we checked that $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)'' \subseteq \sigma_5(X_{m,d})(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)'$. By a theorem of Chevalley on the image of an algebraic variety by an algebraic map ([20, Ex. I.3.18]) all sets $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)$, $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)''$, $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)'$ are constructible. Thus we may speak about the irreducible components of the sets $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)$, $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)''$, $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)'$ and the dimension of each of this irreducible component; indeed, they are the irreducible components of the closure (in the Zariski topology) of the subsets $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)$ or $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)'$ of the projective variety $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})$. Take two schemes A_1, A_2 with the same type. Since $\deg(A_1 \cup A_2) \leq 10 \leq d - 1$, we have $h^1(\mathcal{I}_{A_1 \cup A_2}(d)) = 0$. Hence Grassmann's formula gives $\langle \nu_d(A_1)\rangle \cap \langle \nu_d(A_2)\rangle = \langle \nu_d(A_1 \cap A_2)\rangle$. Using the description of all possible schemes of type $(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)$ given in the proof of Theorem 1 and Remark 6 we get that each set $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)''$ is irreducible and with the following dimension:

(i) $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(1; 5)''$ has dimension $5m$.
(ii) $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(2; 3, 2)''$ has dimension $5m + 1$.
(iii) $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(2; 4, 1)''$ has dimension $5m + 1$.
(iv) $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(3; 3, 1, 1)''$ has dimension $5m + 2$.
(v) $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(3; 2, 2, 1)''$ has dimension $5m + 2$.
(vi) $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(4; 2, 1, 1, 1)''$ has dimension $5m + 3$.
(vii) $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(5; 1, 1, 1, 1)''$ has dimension $5m + 4$.

We get that $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)''$ has codimension $5-s$ in $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})$ (this is the expected codimension). Since each $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)''$ is irreducible, we get that $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)'$ is irreducible of dimension $5m+s-1$ and that it contains a non-empty Zariski open subset of $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)''$, proving the following result.

Proposition 5 *For each $(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)$ the sets $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)'$ and $\sigma_5(X_{m,d})(s; b_1, \dots, b_s)''$ are irreducible and of dimension $5m+s-1$.*

To get the dimension of the the set of all associated degree d homogeneous polynomials, add $+1$ to each dimension, because proportional polynomials, say f and cf with $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{O\}$, have the same associated point $P \in \mathbb{P}^r$

4 Remarks on possible further works

Remark 9 We briefly explain what is missing to complete the stratification by rank of $\sigma_5(X_{m,d}) \setminus \sigma_4(X_{m,d})$. The case with very low d seems to be difficult, full of nasty cases and not very enlightening, but cases like $d = 7, 8$ may be easy (when A is not unique, just take the one which gives a lower rank). It may be easy to check which integers $r_{m,d}(P)$ appears for some $P \in \sigma_5(X_{m,d}) \setminus \sigma_4(X_{m,d})$ just because only very few integers are possible. For a fixed P the proof of Theorem 1 may be not enough to compute the integer $r_{m,d}(P)$, but probably all a priori possible integers arise for some P for which the proof of Theorem 1 works.

Fix any integer $d \geq 5$ and any A evincing the cactus rank of some P. If A is curvilinear, but not connected, i.e. if $s \geq 2$, then we know its single pieces A_i and in each case by [5] or [4] we know the rank, ρ_i, of any $Q_i \in \langle \nu_d(A_i) \rangle$ such that $Q_i \notin \langle \nu_d(A') \rangle$ for any $A' \subsetneq A_i$. We always have $r_{m,d}(P) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{s} \rho_i$. This is a good upper bound (e.g. we always have $r_{m,d}(P) \leq 3d+1$ if $s = 2$ and $r_{m,d}(P) \leq 2d+1$ if $s = 3$), but in some cases we know that it is not the exact value. The case $s = 5$ is trivial and hence we assume $s \leq 4$. If $\dim(\langle A \rangle) = 1$, then we have $r_{m,d}(P) = d-3$ by a theorem of Sylvester ([11]). If $\dim(\langle A \rangle) = 2$ (and in particular always if $m = 2$), then an upper bound is obtained looking at the minimal degree of a reduced curve containing A (see Proposition 6). When $s = 1$ and $\dim(\langle A \rangle) = 3$ there is a unique non-curvilinear case ([17, Case III of Theorem 1.3]). For this case we have a lower bound, $3d-3$, and an upper bound, $4d$, but we don't even know if the integer $r_{m,d}(P)$ is the same for all non-curvilinear A and all P with A as its associated scheme.

Proposition 6 *Assume $d \geq 9$. Fix $P \in \mathbb{P}^r$ with $b_{r,m}(P) = 5$ and assume the existence of a plane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^m$ such that $P \in \langle \nu_d(H) \rangle$. Then $r_{m,d}(P) \leq 3d$. Let A be the only scheme evincing the border rank of A. If either $h^0(H, \mathcal{I}_A(2)) \geq 2$ or A is contained in a reduced conic, then $r_{m,d}(P) \leq 2d$.*

Proof By concision ([24, Exercise 3.2.2.2]) we may assume $m = 2$. Since $d \geq 9$, there is a unique zero-dimensional scheme $A \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ with $\deg(A) = 5$ and

evincing the scheme rank and the border rank of P. Since $h^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2)) = 6$, there is a conic $C \supset A$. If C is reduced, then $r_{m,d}(P) \leq 2d$, because C is connected, $\dim(\langle \nu_d(C) \rangle) = 2d$ and [25, Proposition 5.1] holds (with the same proof) for reduced and connected non-degenerate curves. Hence we may assume that C is a double line, say $C = 2L$. It is easy to check that $\deg(L \cap A) \geq 3$. If $\deg(L \cap A) \geq 4$, then $\mathrm{Res}_L(A)$ is a single point, O, and hence A is contained in any conic $L \cup D$ with D a line containing O (we use that L and D are Cartier divisors of $\mathbb{P}^m$). Hence we may assume $\deg(L \cap A) = 3$. In this case we have $A \subset L \cup D_1 \cup D_2$ with D_1 and D_2 any two distinct lines, $\neq L$, and containing the scheme $\mathrm{Res}_L(A)$. We get $r_{m,d}(P) \leq 3d$ quoting again the same modified version of [25, Proposition 5.1]. We have $h^0(\mathcal{I}_A(2)) \geq 2$ if and only if there is a line L with $\deg(L \cap A) \geq 4$.

5 Conclusions

We give the stratification by the symmetric tensor rank of all degree $d \geq 9$ homogeneous polynomials with border rank 5 and which depend essentially on at least 5 variables, extending two previous works ([5] for border ranks 2 and 3, [4] for border rank 4). For the polynomials which depend on at least 5 variables only 5 ranks are possible: 5, $d+3$, $2d+1$, $3d-1$, $4d-3$, but each of the ranks $3d-1$ and $2d+1$ is achieved in two geometrically different situations. These ranks are uniquely determined by a certain degree 5 zero-dimensional scheme A associated to the polynomial. The polynomial depends essentially on at least 5 variables if and only if A is linearly independent. The polynomial has rank $4d-3$ (resp $3d-1$, resp. $2d+1$, resp. $d+3$, resp. 5) if A has 1 (resp. 2, resp. 3, resp. 4, resp. 5) connected components. The assumption $d \geq 9$ guarantees that each polynomial has a uniquely determined associated scheme A.

In each case we describe the dimension of the families of the polynomials with prescribed rank, each irreducible family being determined by the degrees of the connected components of the associated scheme A. Each family of polynomials has dimension $5m + s$, where $s = 1, \dots, 5$ is the number of connected components of A (Remark 8).

When A has at least 3 connected components we also describe all linear forms evincing the rank ρ of the polynomial f, i.e. all linear forms ℓ_i such that $f = \sum_{i=1}^{\rho} \lambda_i \ell_i^d$, $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, up to a non-zero multiple of each ℓ_i and a permutation of $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_c$.

The proofs require projective geometry and some algebraic geometry.

Acknowledgements We thanks the referee for useful comments.

References

1. L. Albera, P. Chevalier, P. Comon and A. Ferreol: On the virtual array concept for higher order array processing, IEEE Trans. Sig. Proc. 53, no. 4, 1254–1271 (2005)

2. E. Ballico: Subsets of the variety $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ evincing the X-rank of a point of $\mathbb{P}^n$, Houston J. Math. 42, no. 3, 803–824 (2016)
3. E. Ballico and A. Bernardi: Decomposition of homogeneous polynomials with low rank , Math. Z. 271, 1141–1149 (2012)
4. E. Ballico and A. Bernardi: Stratification of the fourth secant variety of Veronese variety via the symmetric rank, Adv. Pure Appl. Math. 4, no. 2, 215–250 (2013)
5. A. Bernardi, A. Gimigliano and M. Idà: Computing symmetric rank for symmetric tensors, J. Symbolic Comput. 46, no. 1, 34–53 (2011)
6. A. Bernardi and K. Ranestad: The cactus rank of cubic forms, J. Symbolic Comput. 50, 291–297 (2013)
7. J. Brachat, P. Comon, B. Mourrain and E. P. Tsigaridas: Symmetric tensor decomposition, Linear Algebra Appl. 433(11-12), 1851–1872 (2010)
8. W. Buczyńska and J. Buczyński: Secant varieties to high degree veronese reembeddings, catalecticant matrices and smoothable Gorenstein schemes, J. Algebraic Geom. 23, 63–90 (2014)
9. J. Buczyński, A. Ginensky and J. M. Landsberg: Determinantal equations for secant varieties and the Eisenbud-Koh-Stillman conjecture, J. London Math. Soc. (2) 88, 1–24 (2013)
10. P. Chevalier: Optimal separation of independent narrow-band sources - concept and performance, Signal Processing, Elsevier, 73, 27–48, special issue on blind separation and deconvolution (1999)
11. G. Comas and M. Seiguer: On the rank of a binary form. Found. Comp. Math. 11, no. 1, 65–78 (2011)
12. P. Comon: Independent Component Analysis, in: J-L. Lacoume, editor, Higher Order Statistics, 29–38. Elsevier, Amsterdam, London, (1992)
13. P. Comon, G. H. Golub, L.-H. Lim and B. Mourrain: Symmetric tensors and symmetric tensor rank, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. 30, no. 3,1254–1279 (2008)
14. P. Comon and B. Mourrain: Decomposition of quantics in sums of powers of linear forms, Signal Processing, Elsevier 53, 2, (1996)
15. L. De Lathauwer and J. Castaing: Tensor-based techniques for the blind separation of ds-cdma signals, Signal Processing 87, no. 2, 322–336 (2007)
16. M. C. Dogăn and J. M. Mendel: Applications of cumulants to array processing. I. aperture extension and array calibration, IEEE Trans. Sig. Proc. 43, no. 5, 1200–1216 (1995)
17. D. Eisenbud and J. Harris: Finite projective schemes in linearly general position, J. Algebraic Geom. 1, no. 1, 15–30 (1992)
18. Ph. Ellia and Ch. Peskine: Groupes de points de $\mathbf{P}^2$: caractère et position uniforme, in: Algebraic geometry (L' Aquila, 1988), 111–116, Lecture Notes in Math., 1417, Springer, Berlin (1990)
19. M. Granger: Géométrie des schémas de Hilbert ponctuels, Mém. Soc. Math. France (N.S.) 2^e série 8, 1–84 (1983)
20. R. Hartshorne: Algebraic geometry, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1977)
21. J. Jelisiejew: An upper bound for the Waring rank of a form, Arch. Math. 102, 329–336 (2014)
22. T. Jiang and N. D. Sidiropoulos: Kruskal's permutation lemma and the identification of CANDECOMP/PARAFAC and bilinear models, IEEE Trans. Sig. Proc. 52, no. 9, 2625–2636 (2004)
23. A. Iarrobino and V. Kanev: Power sums, Gorenstein algebras, and determinantal loci, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1721, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Appendix C by Iarrobino and Steven L. Kleiman (1999)
24. J. M. Landsberg: Tensors: Geometry and Applications, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, Vol. 128, Amer. Math. Soc. Providence (2012)
25. J. M. Landsberg and Z. Teitler: On the ranks and border ranks of symmetric tensors, Found. Comput. Math. 10, no. 3, 339–366 (2010)
26. L.-H. Lim and V. de Silva: Tensor rank and the ill-posedness of the best low-rank approximation problem, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. 30, no. 3, 1084–1127 (2008)
27. P. McCullagh: Tensor Methods in Statistics. Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability, Chapman and Hall (1987)
28. K. Ranestad and F.-O. Schreyer: On the rank of a symmetric form, J. Algebra 346, 340–342 (2011)